```
1
                           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                           DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
2
                           CIVIL ACTION NO. 83-2864 SA
3
    ANTONIO CIPOLLONE, individually
    And as Executor of the Estate of
5
    ROSE D. CIPOLLONE,
 6
                Plaintiff,
                                        Deposition
                                                     of:
7
          V#:
                                        SEYMOUR SUDMAN
    LIGGETT GROUP, INC., a
8
    Delaware corporation; PHILIP
    MORRIS INCORPORATED, a Virginia
    Corporation; LOEW'S THEATRES,
10
    INC., a New York corporation,
11
                Defendants.
12
13
14
          TRANSCRIPT of testimony as taken by and
    before MARGARET J. TEILHABER, a Certified
15
    Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State
17
    of New Jersey, at the offices of WEBSMER &
    SHEFFIELD, 237 Park Avenue, New York, New York,
18
    on Tuesday, October 27, 1987.
19
20
21
22
          BUDD, LARNER, GROSS, FICILLO, ROSENBAUM,
          GREENBERG & SADE
          150 John F. Kennedy Parkway
23
          Short Hills, New Jersey 07078
          BY: MARC Z. EDELL, ESQ.
24
          For the Plaintiff
25
```

```
N C E S: (Continued)
 1.
          WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD
 2
          237 Park Avenue
          New York, New York 10017
 3
          BY: JAMES V. KEARNEY, ESQ.
               JAMES H. GIANNINOTO, ESQ.
          For Liggett Group, Inc.
 5
          SHOOK, HARDY & BACON
          20th Floor
          Mercantile Bank Tower
 7
          1101 Walnut
          Kansas City, Missouri
                                  64106
          BY: STEVEN C. PARRISH, ESQ.
          For Philip Morris, Inc. and Lorillard, Inc.
          BROWN, CONNERY, KULP, WILLE,
          PURNELL & GREENE
10
          Parkade Building
          518 Market Street
11
          P.O. Box 1449
          Canden, New Jersey 08101
12
          BY: RAYMOND F. DROZDOWSKI, ESQ.
          for Philip Morris, Inc.
13
          ARNOLD & PORTER
14
          1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
          Washington, D.C. 20036
15
          BY: PETER K. BLEAKLEY, ESQ.
               THOMAS R. SILFEN, ESQ.
16
          For Philip Morris, Inc.
17
          STRYKER, TAME & DILL
          33 Washington Street
18
          Heuark, Heu Jersey
                               07102
          RY: EDGAR M. WHITING, ESQ.
19
          For Lorillard, Inc.
20
    ALSO PRESENT:
21
          Nichele Brown
22
23
24
25
```

1	·	INDEX	•
2	GITNESS	DIRECT	-
3	SEYMOUR S	UDHAH	·
4	By Mr.	Edell; 4	
5	,		
· 6	,		
7		EXHIBITS	
	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	<u>IDENTIFICATION</u>
·	Sudman-1	8-page document	20
9		entitled Public	
		Knowledge About the	
10		Health Hazards of Smoking	
11		: •	
12	Sudman-2	Multi-page document entitled Number of	51
• •		Articles on Health	
13		Dangers of Cigarette	
		1948-1980	
14			
15	Sudman-3	27-page handwritten document with the	104
13	_	question on first	
16		page, "Do think the	
		chance of getting lung	
17		cancer are the same for	•
:		people who don't smoke	• "
18		cigarettes as they are	•
19		for people who do smoke cigarettes"	1
17		Cidaterres.	•
20	Sudman-4	8-page computer run,	154
		Gallup Poll, May 14-17,	
21		1971	
22	Sudman-5	14-page computer run,	154
		Gallup Poll, June 12-17	
23		1959 .	
24	Sudman-6	13-page computer run,	154
- •		Gallup Poll, July 24-29	
25		1969	

SETHOUR SUDMAN,

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

[DELETED]

SWOTH ..

DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. EDELL:

MR. EDELL: So we have it on the record, we had a conversation concerning the witness' response to the subpoena that was served on the defendants and accepted on behalf of the witness in this matter and could you just tell us whether or not we received all of the information that was responsive to that subpoena or if there were any materials held back because of objections.

MR. KEARNEY: No. You received all of the documents that were responsive to the subpoena except for correspondence between the lawyers and the witness which are, as I understand it, work product and have been claimed as such by you in the course of this case.

MR. EDELL: I had up until the point in time that the defendants refused to provide me with correspondence to and from their witnesses provided the defendants with such correspondence. It was only in response to the defendants'

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 objection and failure to produce similar

2 | correspondence for their experts that I

3 discontinued providing the defendants with

4 correspondence to and from my experts.

5 MR. KEARNEY: I had a different

6 understanding of it. All I understood is that we

7 did not get that information from or in connection

with the testimony of Jeffrey Harris and some of

9 the others.

12

10 MR. EDELL: You did get all

11 correspondence to and from Jeffrey Harris.

MR. KEARNEY: I have a recollection of

13 some cases that were testified about that you sent

14 him that we never got.

15 MR. EDELL: We assume that you had

16 access to the -- I don't know whether it will

17 | serve any purpose. I'm sure Steve Parrish can

18 | clarify the history of this thing but that was the

19 position and it's memorialized in some letters to

20 the defendants but just for the purposes of the

21 record, there are correspondence to and from this

22 witness pertinent to this litigation that have not

23 been produced based upon some objection. Is that

24 correct?

25

MR. KEARNEY: There are documents that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
· 6
    Sudman - direct
    we understand have fallen under the category of
 2
    attorney's work product as that category has been
 3
    used as I understand it by the plaintiff and then
    in turn by the defendants in this case.
    documents were basically these transmittal letters
    and transmittal letters respecting bills and
    payments and I'll be glad to revisit that if you
 7
    can show me in the record that those types of
 9
    documents were produced for all of your witnesses
10
    and indeed all correspondence and notes of
    communications between you and your witnesses were
11
12
    produced to us because I don't believe that was
    the state of affairs.
13
                MR. EDELL:
                            As I indicated previously,
14
15
    we had up until the point in time that the
    defendants refused to produce such documents in
16
    response to subpoents served upon their experts
17
    provided to the defendants correspondence for and
18
19
    from our experts. It was only when the defendants
20
    subsequently objected and refused to produce such
    documents that we similarly refused to produce
21
22
    them.
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Whatever the
23
24
    on that matter, it is.
```

Professor Sudman, my name is Marc

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Q.

25

1 Edell. We introduced ourselves before we started

2 this proceeding. I represent the plaintiff in

3 this case. You have testified before, sir?

4 A. Yes, I have.

5 Q. How many times have you testified

6 either in an administrative proceeding, at trial

7 or in deposition?

8 A. Several times. I don't have a count in my

9 head right now.

10 Q. Let's go through those times that you

11 can recall testifying either at an administrative

12 | hearing or deposition or trial.

13 A. Depositions and administrative hearings for

14 the Federal Trade Commission, two separate times,

15 hearings before the Florida and the Illinois

16 Commerce Commissions, depositions in a trademark

17 case, another one in a patent case and that's all

18 I can remember at this time.

19 g. The depositions and testimony at an

20 administrative hearing on behalf of the Federal

21 Trade Commission on two separate occasions, was

22 that in regard to the same subject matter?

23 A. No. Those were two separate cases.

Q. What were the two separate cases?

A. One case dealt with Litton microwave ovens.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

8 Sudman - direct 1 That was a case of advertising for which there was 2 not sufficient proof and the other was with 3 Volkswagen of America where the FTC claimed that. Volkswagen had deceived purchasers of their car in terms of the messages they sent them. You were kind enough to furnish to us within the last week transcripts of the Volkswagen 8 matter. Do you have a transcript regarding the 9 Litton microwave matter? I looked for it and I cannot find it. 10 Apparently I must have sent it back with 11 12 corrections. I don't have it. or it's not in my I looked fairly carefully. 13 Can you just give us a little bit more 14 detail as to the Litton microwave matter? 15 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 16 17 the question. You can answer the question. 18 Where shall I start? 19 the Federal Trade Commission in a case that they conducted against Litton. Litton had published 20 ads which appeared in a wide range of the media 21 and the ads said three-quarters of all microwave 22 oven repairmen prefer Litton to all other brands 23 and the Federal Trade Commission asked me to 24

investigate the basis on which this ad had been

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
9
    Sudman - direct
 1
    published, that is, the data that Litton used, and
 2
    then asked me to testify about that data.
 3
                Did you perform any survey research or
    was it simply an examination of the information
 5
    that Litton microwave had?
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 6
 7
    the question.
8
                THE WITNESS:
                              Would you repeat the
9
    question.
10
                (Question read.)
          When you say did I perform any survey
11
    research, do you mean did I-actually myself
12
    conduct interviews? Tell se what I'm supposed to
13
    take that to mean.
14
                Did you design a research survey
15
          Q.
    plan? Did you interview respondents to a
16
    questionnaire? Did you devise a questionnaire?
17
    Did you supervise a survey research project in
18
19
    which interviewers were given questionnaires and
    instructions and sent out into the field to
20
    interview people? Did they do it by telephone?
21
    Did you do any of those things?
22
23
          No.
    A i
                What type of survey research, if any,
24
    did you do with regard to the Litton microwave
```

```
10
    Sudman - direct
1
          Didn't I just say? I evaluated the research
 2
 3
    that they did.
                That was my first question.
          Q.
                MR. KEARMEY: Object to the form of
 5
    the question, the form of the statement.
7
    no question.
                How did you evaluate this research,
,
    sir?
          I examined the documents that Litton
10
    provided indicating how they had done the survey.
11
                What were those documents?
12
                                     As I recall, there
          It has been a long time.
13
    was a copy of the questionnaire and a copy of an
14
    internal report that was prepared in which the
15
    results of the survey were given and there was
16
    some correspondence as well.
17
                 pid you formulate any conclusions upon
18
    your examination of these materials?
19
          Yes, I did.
20
                 Can you tell us what those conclusions
21
22
    were?
          I concluded that on the basis of the sample
23
    that Litton had chosen that their claims that
```

three-quarters of all microwave service repairmen

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

```
11
    Sudman - direct
    preferred Litton had no basis.
 1
 2
                What was it about the sample that led
 3
    you to that conclusion?
          Litton for reasons which were never made
 5
    clear had chosen a sample not of all microwave
    service repairmen but of their own authorized --
 7
    they had a small group from among all microwave
    service repairmen, a small group who were
9
    authorized by them to service Litton.
10
    evident that such a group might very well have
    ties towards Litton which would bias their results
11
12
    and they could not possibly represent the total
13
    number of microwave service repairmen who were
    approximately ten times as many as that and that
15
    was the basis of my testimony.
16
                Was your deposition taken in that
17
    matter or was it only testimony before an
16
    administrative hearing?
19
          There was a deposition.
20
                Do you remember who took your
    deposition?
21
          My memory says Mr. Adair but it has been
22
23
    quite awhile.
24
```

25

1 Q. Do you know the name of the firm?

2 A. I don't recall at this time.

Q. Tell us about the testimony before the Florida Commerce Commission.

5 MR. KEARMET: Object to the form of

6 the question.

Q. What was that about, sir?

8 A. Are you asking me --

Q. There's no secret questions. I just

10 | want --

3

7

9

17

11 A. Are you asking me what I said or what the

12 | case was about?

13 Q. Basically what the case was about and 14 what you said and we can get into greater detail.

15 MR. KEARHEY: I object to the form of

16 the question. You can answer it.

A. This was a case relating to Southern Bell.

18 Southern Bell was exploring the use of measured

19 service in the Miami area. Measured service is a

20 local telephone service where people do not pay a

21 flat charge but pay a charge based on the number

22 of calls they make, how many minutes they spend on

the phone and how far the calls go from their

24 houe.

23

25 Q. What was your testimony in that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
13
 1
 2
            survey had been conducted and I
 3
    whether in my expert opinion that
 5
                Who conducted the survey that you
    examined and formulated certain opinions with
 7
    respect to?
          Richard Day & Associates.
 9
                What was the nature of the survey?
10
                   survey asking people about their
11
    telephone usage and about their attitudes towards
12
13
                What were your conclusions?
14
          As I can reconstruct them now, my
    conclusions were that the survey had been in
    general carefully conducted and that the results
16
17
    could be relied upon.
18
                Tell us about the Illinois Commerce
19
    Consission case.
                MR. KEARNEY:
20
                               Object to the form of
21
    the question.
22
23
24
```

Bell -- I'm sorry '-- GTE is interested in local

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

	Sudman - direct
1	measured service for certain communities in
2	Illinois. Again a survey had been conducted and I
3	was asked my opinions about that study.
•	q. Have you ever conducted a survey with
5	respect to consumer awareness about potential
6	health hazards associated with the use of a
7	product?
8	A. No, I haven't.
9	Q. Have you written any papers the
0	subject of which was the construction and
1	execution of survey research concerning public
2	opinions with respect to health hazards associated
3	with the use of products?
4	A. No, I haven't.
5	Q. Are you an expert in consumer
6	behavior?
.7	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
8	the question. You can answer it.
9	A. Are you asking me whether I consider
2.0	myself to have some knowledge of the field of
21	consumer behavior. It is not my major area of
22	expertise.
2 3	Q. Is there a recognized academic
	l se

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

Objection to the form of

```
15
    Sudman - direct
    the question.
 2
          You'll have to help me a little bit with
 3
    this. Are you asking me are there departments of
    consumer behavior?
 5
                I'll make it as easy as I can.
    survey research a recognized field of academic
 7
    discipline?
          I can't answer that question. If you tell
    me what you mean by a recognized field, if you say
10
    are there any courses --
                Are there professors who teach survey
11
          Q.
12
    research?
13
          Who are called professors of survey research
    or who teach?
15
                Who teach survey research.
          Yes.
16
                Are there people who you consider
17
    scholars in the area of survey research?
18
19
          Yes.
                Are there people who you consider to
20
    be scholars in the area of consumer behavior?
21
22
          Yes.
23
          Q.
                Are you a scholar in consumer
    behavior?.
24
25
          I'll leave that judgment to somebody else.
```

```
Sudman - direct
```

- Q. Are you a scholar with respect to survey research?
 - A. I think I am.
- Q. But you don't have an opinion with respect to whether you are a scholar or not in the area of consumer behavior?
- 7 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 8 the question.
 - Q. Is that correct, sir?
- 10 A. It is certainly an area of scholarly
- 11 interest to me. Whether that makes me a scholar
- 12 | in it --

3

9

- 13 . Q. You told us that you were a scholar in
- 14 survey research. Using the same criteria, do you
- 15 consider yourself to be a scholar in consumer
- 16 behavior?
- 17 A. I'm not sure.
- 18 Q. What criteria in your opinion is
- 19 necessary before you consider someone to be a
- 20 scholar in consumer behavior?
- 21 A. I really haven't thought about this prior to
- 22 your asking me this question. If you give me a
- 23 | moment, I'll think about it and give you an
- 24 answer.
 - 5 Q. Take your time.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

,	Sudman - direct
1	MR. KEARNEY: Take your time.
2	(Short pause.)
3	A. There are a variety of ways in which people
4	can exhibit scholarship. One is in publications
5	in professional journals. A second is in the
6	training of graduate students in the area. A
7	third would be in the reviewing and editing of
8	other people's work. When I say editing, I mean
è	basically the decision as to whether that work is
0	of publishable quality. Those are the things that
1	come to mind at this point.
2	Q. Are there professors in consumer
. 3	behavior at the University of Illinois?
4	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
. 5	the question.
l 6	A. We don't have anyone who is called a
17	professor of consumer behavior.
8	Q. You are not called a professor of
19	survey research?
2 0	A. That's right.
2 1	Q. You are called a professor of business
2 2	administration and sociology and research.
23	Correct?

24

25

18

Sudman - direct

1 of Illinois who teach consumer behavior?

2 A. Yes, there are.

3 Q. What are their titles?

4 A. They are in the Department of Susiness

5 Administration. There are some people in the

College of Communications, in the Department of

7 Advertising.

Q. When was it that you were first

9 retained by any attorneys in this matter?

10 A. In this case?

Q. In this case.

12 A. My memory tells me sometime in 1986.

Q. Had you been retained by any lawyers

14 in this case to work on any other matter prior to

15 | that?

11

13

19

24

16 A. Yes, I had.

17 Q. By whom?

18 A. By the attorneys at Webster & Sheffield.

Q. To act as an expert in what case?

20 A. This was the Palmer case.

21 Q. When were you first retained to act as

22 a expert in the Falmer case?

23 A. My memory tells me it was sometime in 1985.

Q. What work did you do in regard to the

25 Palmer case?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

408 Northfield Avenue West Grange, N. J. 07052 201-731-8666 2017012949

- 1 A. Basically I examined the status of public
 2 awareness and beliefs and behavior on the relation
 3 between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.
 - Q. How did you do that?
- 5 A. I used two methods. My primary method was
 6 to examine public opinion polls and surveys that
 7 had been conducted in the time period I was
 8 examining and I also looked at some media coverage
 9 of articles on the relation between cigarette
 10 smoking and health as an indirect method.
 - Q. What was the time period for which you examined the status of public awareness and beliefs and behavior with respect to cigarette smoking and lung cancer in the Palmer case?

 A. My memory tells me again in 1954 and went into the 1980s.
 - Q. Did you prepare any written materials with respect to that examination?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

- Q. Where are those written materials?
- 21 A. I think you have been supplied them.
- 22 Q. Did you prepare a report with respect
 23 to your examination of the status of public
 24 awareness, beliefs and behaviors with respect to
 25 cigarette smoking and lung cancer in the Falmer

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
20
    Sudman - direct
    case?
 1
 2
          I prepared a draft.
 3
                 Is that this document over here?
 4
 5
                MR. EDELL:
                             Can we mark that, please.
 6
                 (Sudman Exhibit 1 marked for
    identification.)
 7
                I show you what has been marked Sudman
 8
    Exhibit 1 for identification, which is the
 9
    document that you indicated was a draft report of
10
    the results of your work in the Falmer case.
11
                               I object to the form of
12
                MR. KEARNEY:
    the question. Or actually statement.
13
                Do you have it?
14
          Yes, I have it. Is there a question?
15
            I didn't hear the question.
16
                 I just said I handed the document to
17
          Just so there's no problem here, why don't
18
    you tell us exactly what Sudman Exhibit 1 is.
19
          The title on the document is public
20
    knowledge about the health hazards of smoking.
21
    It's a draft document that I prepared for possible
22
23
    use in the Palmer case.
24
                 Use in regard to what, sir?
          If I were asked to provide testimony, I
25
```

	Sudman - direct
1	would have used information contained in this
2	document.
3	Q. When did you prepare that document,
4	Sudman Exhibit 1?
5	A. I really can't remember. Sometime in 1985
6	is right, I think.
7	Q. What public opinion surveys did you
8	examine with respect to your work in the Falmer
9	case?
10	A. Primarily the data I examined most carefully
11	were the Gallup polls.
12	Q. What other public opinion surveys
13	other than the Gallup polls did you review with
14	respect to your work in the Palmer case?
15	A. I reviewed a series of local polls, the
16	Minnesota and Towa polls, but decided that since
17	they were local and did not relate, I didn't see
18	how they would relate to the Palmer case so I then
19	did not pursue them.
20	Q. Was it your feeling that you could not
21	extrapolate from those local polls through to the
22	geographic area in which Mr. Palmer lived? Is that
23	correct?

24

- Q. Is that correct?
- 2 A. I wasn't sure whether there was any value.
- 3 It would be difficult to know how to use data from
- 4 Minnesota and Iowa in a case that related to
- 5 Massachusetts.
- 6 Q. Why would it be difficult, sir? Why
- 7 | would it be difficult to know how to use the data
- from surveys in Minnesota and Iowa in the Palmer
- 9 case?

1

- 10 A. Well, in the absence of additional
- 11 information, one would not know whether the data
- 12 from Minnesota and Iowa reflected the views of
- 13 everyone in the United States or only people in
- 14 Minnesota and Iowa.
- 15 Q. What additional information would be
- 16 | necessary in order to ascertain whether or not the
- 17 results of the polls in Minnesota and Iowa were
- 18 reflective of opinions in the United States in
- 19 general or simply those in the geographic area in
- 20 which the surveys were conducted?
- 21 A. It's not obvious to se that there would be
- 22 any additional information which would make data
- 23 from Minnesota and Iowa represent the United
- 24 States.

25

g. Did you review any additional public

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

- l opinion surveys other than the Gallup surveys, the
- 2 local surveys in Minnesota and Iowa with respect
- 3 to your work in the Palmer case?
- 4 A. I don't remember reviewing any additional
- 5 surveys for the Palmer case.
- 6 Q. So the document Sudman Exhibit 1 was
- 7. prepared at a time that you had only reviewed the
- 8 public opinion survey polls conducted by the
- 9 Gallup organization and the local surveys prepared
- 10 with respect to Minnesota and Iowa. Is that
- 11 | correct, sir?
- 12 A. Yes, I believe that's correct.
- 13 Q. What other materials did you review
- 14 with respect to your work in the Palmer case?
- 15 A. I also reviewed news stories that were found
- 16 in the New York Times Index and in the Reader's
- 17 Guide to Periodical Literature.
- 18 Q. Why was it that you used the index to
- 19 news stories in the New York Times in the Palmer
- 20 case?
- 21 A. That question has the -- the why can refer
- 22 to many different things.
- 23 Q. I would like to know all of the things
- 24 | to which you think that "why" may refer.
- 25 A. First of all, the New York Times Index is

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

one that is readily available to se at the

2 University of Illinois library. I've used it on

3 several other occasions in trying to get

4 information on what the media contain. I've

5 tested it and found that one can rely on it. That

6 is, when it reports something being found, it is

7 found where it says it is. And it gave me the

8 ability to look at news media coverage in the New

York Times for a series of years since there is an

10 annual index.

11

12

13

Q. Any other reasons why you used the index to the news stories for the New York Times in the Palmer case?

14 A. I consider that index as one measure of

15 input into public opinion. That is, if indeed one

16 raised questions about the polls and said how do

17 | we know that what the polls are reporting is

18 accurate, the polls are an output measure. They

19 measure public awareness and knowledge and input

20 measures are useful to help collaborate the output

21 measure.

22

24

The New York Times obviously is not the only

23 source of information about what the media

contained. It's the only source which at that

25 point in time there was a convenient index for.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

9	u	đ	8	•	-	A	4	_	_	~	٠
-	-		-	 	_			_			┖.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

- There were no indices for broadcast media or other
 newspapers that I was aware of so I used it as an
 indicator of what other print media might have
 said in terms of trends over time.
 - Q. What do you mean by trends over time?

 A. That is the amount of coverage that was given to the relationship between cigarette smoking and health over time.
 - Q. You indicated in your prior response that polls measure awareness and knowledge. Is that correct?
- MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question. You can answer the question.
- 14 A. I really don't remember what I said.
 - Q. Let me ask you whether or not in your opinion research polls measure awareness and knowledge.
- 18 A. And other things also. Yes, they measure 19 those and they measure other things, too.
- Q. In addition to awareness and knowledge, what else do public opinion polls reflect?
- NR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question. You can answer the question.
- 25 A. If we take in a sense the universe of all

```
Sudman - direct
    opinion poils, it is certainly possible that in
    addition to awareness and knowledge, opinion
    polls, some opinion polls measure behavior, some
    opinion polls measure attitudes. It is not the
 S
    case necessarily that any single opinion poll
    would measure all of those things but the set of
 7
    all opinion polls together shall measure those
- 5
    things and possibly other things as well.
                What other things as well?
10
          Demographic characteristics.
    characteristics of a house, how many rooms it has
11
12
    and things of this sort.
                              There may well be other
    things that don't come to me at this moment that
13
    have been measured in opinion polls.
14
                But a public opinion poll can be used
15
    to answer questions with respect to awareness, .
16
17
    knowledge, behavior and attitudes.
18
    correct?
                MR. KEARNEY:
                              Objection to the form of
19
    the question.
20
          I thought I answered that question.
21
                This is another question.
22
23
          Okay.
                Do you want it read back?
24
          That is, the totality of all opinion polls-
25
```

27 Sudman - direct can measure attitudes, knowledge, 2 behavior but these may not be measured necessarily 3 in any one poll. Can one devise an opinion survey to answer questions with respect to awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitude in one survey, sir? 8 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question. You've asked that a bit too abstractly for 10 11 answer. About what? Anything? 12 We can start with anything and then we can narrow our way down. 13 I think in the abstract I can't answer the 14 question. If it gets narrower, I might be able to 15 answer it. 16 With respect to public opinion 17 Q. concerning health hazards, can one construct one 18 opinion survey to answer questions with respect to 19 awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitudes? 20 21 Health hazards? As it stands, it's still, I think, too general for me to say yes. I think one 22 would have to be more specific about what one is 23 talking about in terms of health hazards before I 24

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters 40\$ Northfield Avenue West Orange. N. J. 07052 201-731-8686

could answer whether it is or isn't possible.

```
Sudman - direct
```

1

3

5

7

9

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That is, it is possible, I suppose, to imagine questions that could not be answered by a public opinion poll.

Q. Let's say I wanted to find out what the public was aware of, their knowledge and their behavior and attitude with respect to arsenic and any health hazards associated with the use of arsenic. Could you devise one poll that would answer the questions of awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitude?

11 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 12 the question.

A. I guess I'm still going to have to say I don't know.

Q. Can you think of any product, sir, for which you could devise a single public opinion poll to answer questions with respect to awareness, knowledge and behavior and attitudes with regard to that product and any hazards attendant to the use of the product?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question. Can I have the question reread, please.

(Question read.)

A. . The problem I'm having is that the phrase

waga and spineili certified shorthand reporters

health hazards is so global that it's not clear to

me what you have in mind. You must have something

in mind as you are asking it. I'm not sure what

it is and I can't answer the question. It isn't

the product category I think that's the major

stumbling block here.

- Q. It's my use of the phrase health hazard. Is that correct?
- 9 A. Yes.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. The phrase health hazard, I have to define that more narrowly before you could tell me whether you could devise such a poll. Is that right?
 - A. I don't know what it is. If you give me a specific question and ask me whether it's possible to ask that question, I could respond.
 - Q. Could you devise a public opinion survey that would answer questions with respect to awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitudes with regard to any product and any harmful effects of that product?
 - A. I think the question is still so general that I have to say I don't know.
 - Q. Why is that? What is it about the question that makes it difficult for you to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 | answer?

A. You are asking me sort of to sit here and tell you whether I can design a survey. Normally when someone asks someone to design a survey, they give a much more detailed expression of what it is they are looking for. You are asking me sort of to respond to a very global kind of a question and I guess the answer is I don't know.

Q. If I was a manufacturer of product X and I came to you and I said, Professor Sudman, I want to find out what the public is aware of, what the public's knowledge is, what their behavior is and what their attitudes are with regard to my product and anything that they have heard concerning harmful effects of my product, what other questions would you want to ask me before you could devise such an opinion survey?

A. We would have to have a long, long discussion about why the survey is being conducted.

Q. Why is that important, sir?

A. Because one of the chief reasons -- I mean one doesn't do surveys for no reason. There needs to be a reason for doing the survey and one of the major problems with collecting data might be that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct

the data would not be what, related to what the

survey is supposed to be done for.

Q. I want to look into the question that

I just posed to you and I don't really have any

other interest other than finding out this

information. There is no ulterior motive. All I

want to do is find out the information.

A. In general, one of the things that we advise is that data not be collected simply to satisfy curiosity. That's not why people collect data.

People collect data to have something to do with a decision process of some sort, data to be used survey. That's what I'm driving at.

- Q. Let's assume that I wanted to find out whether I should put a warning on my product.
- 16 A. What's the question?

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 17 Q. What else do you want to know before
 18 you could devise such a survey?
 - A. I guess given the example that you've now given about trying to decide whether there should be a warning, and assuming that it was clear what the warning should be, it would be possible to design a survey to test that warning.
 - Q. With regard to questions of awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitudes. Is that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
32
    Sudman - direct
    correct?
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
2
3
    the question.
          We are off now.
                I'm not looking to test the warning,
5
    devised warning.
          You are not.
7
                I came to you, Professor Sudman,
8
    scholar in survey research, and said to you,
    Professor, I'm the manufacturer of product A, I
10
    want to find out what people know concerning
11
    health hazards associated with the use of my
12
    product and specifically I want information with
13
    regard to awareness, knowledge, behavior and
14
    attitudes and the reason that I'm conducting this
15
    survey is because I want to decide whether I
16
    should put a warning on my product, now can you
17
    devise for me one opinion survey that will answer
    my questions of awareness, knowledge, behavior and
19
    attitudes?
20
                               Objection to the form of
                 MR. KEARNET:
21
    the question.
22
          I think this is the sort of a question where
23
```

I'd have to sit down and spend some time thinking

about it, running through possibilities and

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1

2

3

7

8

10

11

.12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

exploring them to see whether at least they might be feasible. It might be possible but now certainly just sitting here right now without having spent some time thinking about it, I guess I'm not ready to give a top of the head answer as to whether it is or isn't possible.

Q. What would be some of the things that you would take into consideration to determine whether or not you could construct and conduct an opinion poll, one opinion poll, that would answer my questions with regard to awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitudes?

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. One of the first thing I would want to ask is why you are so insistent on doing it in one single poll rather than in a series or in multiple polls because it might indeed be that what you are suggesting is better done not in a single poll but in multiple polls for a variety of reasons.

Q. Why don't you tell me what those reasons are, sir.

A. one would simply be respondent fatigue. You might wind up indeed with a questionnaire which is so long that people would get tired and that would

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct
cause you some problems.

The second is that we are aware that within questionnaires the order of the questions and the content of earlier questions might sometimes have an impact on later questions so one would want to explore whether indeed there might be problems by including all of these in a single survey.

There might also be issues of asking people questions about their behavior that would be difficult for them to answer because the strain on memory was too great so we would have to explore carefully whether or not the questions you ask were reasonable, given what we know about human memory. These are some of the issues that come up.

Q. With regard to your work in the Palmer case, did you conduct a content analysis?

MR. FARRISH: Objection to the form of the question.

A. I counted the stories that related to cigarette smoking and health that appeared in the New York Times and in the Reader's Guide. In my view, and I don't claim to be an expert on content analysis, the counting of subject matter

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
35
     Sudman - direct
     information is a form and certainly not the only
 1
 2
     form, a form of content analysis.
 3
           ٥.
                 What criteria did you use in order to
    categorize an article as relating to cigarette
 5
    smoking and health in counting up these articles?
 6
           Basically the article had to relate
 7
    specifically to smoking and a specific disease or
 8
    health in general and I omitted articles that
. 9
    simply related to cigarette company profits or
10
    legal cases or issues of tangential -- that is,
11
    unless health was a key issue in the article, if
12
    it was simply implied, I did not include the
.13
    article.
                 Did you review the articles?
14
            read the summaries which were available in
15
16
    the New York Times Index, which is a couple of
17
    sentences about what goes on.
                 Did you read the articles?
18
19
           No, I did not.
                 You didn't think it was ne
20
    read the articles?
21
22
                 MR. PARRISE:
                               Objection to the form of
```

Is that correct, sir?

I simply report to you that I did not read

wags and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

the question.

23

24

25

```
36
    Sudman - direct
    the articles.
 2
                Did you think it was necessary in
          Q.
 3
    performing this content analysis to review the
    actual articles?
          I don't remember whether at the time -- I
 5
    simply read the summary in the index.
 6
                I understand what you did. I'm just
7
    trying to find out whether you thought it was
    necessary in performing a content analysis to
    review the actual articles or not.
10
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
11
    the question. You can answer.
12
          I did not, I don't remember now thinking at
13
    that time about the issue of necessity.
                As you sit here today, do you have any
15
          Q.
    thoughts with regard to whether or not it would
16
    have been more appropriate for you to have
17
    reviewed the actual articles in performing your
18
    content analysis as opposed to simply relying upon
19
    a summary in the index to stories in the New York
20
21
    Times?
                MR. KEARNEY:
                              Objection to the form of
22
23
    the question.
                MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
24
```

the question.

25

```
1
          For the purposes for which I did this,
 2
    persuaded the method I used was perfectly
 3
    appropriate.
                When you say you did this, is it your
 5
    testimony that you did perform a content analysis,
    formal content analysis?
 7
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 8
    the question.
          I think I answered that question already,
 9
    didn't I? Didn't you ask me whether I did a
10
11
    content analysis?
12
                MR. KEARNEY: Do you want him to
13
    answer it again, Mr. Edell?
14
                MR. EDELL: I'd like him to answer the
15
    question.
                             Read the question,
16
17
    please.
18
                 (Question read.)
          Would you tell me what you mean by formal
19
20
    content analysis.
```

Let me ask you this, sir.

materials in order to research certain subjects?

content analysis a method by which scholars

examine news articles, literature and other

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

21

22

23

24

25

40\$ Northfield Avenue West Grange, N. J. 070\$2 201-731-9666

Objection to the form of

```
38
    Sudman - direct
    the question.
2
                THE WITHESS:
                              Would you repeat the
 3
    question, please.
                (Question read.)
 5
          I think that's a reasonable description.
                What's your definition of content
    analysis, formal content analysis?
 7
                MR. KEARNET: Objection to the form of
8
9
    the question.
                   He asked you what you mean when you
10
    say formal content analysis.
                MR. EDELL: I told him.
11
                MR. KEARNEY: What do you mean?
12
13
    must have missed that.
    analysis?
14
                             If you missed it, then
15
                MR. EDELL:
    we'll have to read the transcript back. I have
    another question here and I'm asking the witness
17
    what his definition of a formal content analysis
19
20
          I don't have one.
                Let me make sure I'm not mistaken.
21
    could have sworn in Sudman Exhibit 1 you used the
22
    phrase "content analysis," did you not, sir?
23
    the first paragraph, did you use that phrase?
24
25
    First paragraph.
```

```
39
          (Examining document.)
 1
 2
                 "The indirect method is through
 3
    content analysis of media to determine the
    frequency with which this issue is discussed."
 5
    you see that?
 6
          Yes.
                What did you mean by "content
7
    analysis" in the context of that sentence?
 8
9
          What I meant is what I did.
                 Have you read scholarly literature
10
11
    concerning content analysis?
                 Have I ever read?
12
13
14
                 In the context of the work that you
15
    do, do you continue to read scholarly literature
16
    in the area of content analysis?
17
                 MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
18
19
          As it's appropriate to what I'm interested
20
    in, I will read information related to content
21
22
    analysis.
                 What information is that, sir?
23
    information is it that you read regarding content
24
    analysis?
```

```
Sudman - direct
```

- 1 A. Journals, articles.
- 2 Q. Are there people who are experts in
- 3 | content analysis?
- 4 A. I don't know.
- 5 Q. Are there scholars on content
- 6 analysis?
- 7 A. I don't know.
- g. Do you know anyone who has ever
- 9 authored an article on content analysis?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Who is that, sir?
- 12 A. I have.
- 13 g. What's the title of your article?
- 14 A. It's a paper which appeared in the Annual
- 15 Review of Sociology on the use of survey methods.
- 16 Q. Did you define content analysis in
- 17 that paper?
- 18 1. No.
- 19 Q. In performing a content analysis, are
- 20 there any research criteria that you apply?
- 21 A. I'm not sure what you mean.
- 22 q. Maybe if we talk about it in terms of
- 23 survey research. I assume that there is some
- 24 research criteria that you apply when you perform
- 25 an opinion survey. Is that right? In conducting

- l the study you look to see whether your sample of
- 2 the general public is representative of the
- 3 | general public, don't you? You want to see
- 4 whether or not the results are within a certain
- 5 | variance, don't you?
- 6 A. The answer is no to both of those.
- 7 Q. All it does is show my ignorance but
- 8 there must be some research criteria that you
- 9 employ when you devise an opinion research survey,
- 10 are there not, sir?
- 11 A. The question is so general that I can't
- 12 answer it in that form. If you talk about a
- 13 specific survey with a specific purpose, then it's
- 14 possible for me to -- there are not criteria which
- 15 are always applied to everything.
- 16 Q. In performing a content analysis, did
- 17 | you attempt to be objective?
- 18 A. Are you asking this in the future or is this
- 19 the past tense? Are you asking se about my
- 20 behavior when I did this one?
- 21 Q. You told me you wrote an article on
- 22 | content analysis.
- 23 | A. Yes
- 24 . Q. You told me that you performed a
- 25 | content analysis in this case.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

-42

Sudman - direct

1 A. Yes.

Q. When you perform content analysis, did
 you attempt to be objective?

4 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

6 A. I can report on past behavior. Is that what
7 you want? Did I attempt to be objective when I

8 was reporting, when I did this content analysis?

9 Is that what you mean?

10 Q. Whenever you conduct a content
11 analysis, did you, Professor Sudman, attempt to be
12 objective?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

15 A. It's not obvious to me that the word

16 objective made any sense in the content analyses

17 that I've done. That wasn't an issue in the cases

18 that I did.

the question.

14

23

25

19 Q. In performing the content analysis

20 which you have performed or ever performed, have

21 you attempted to be systematic?

22 A. Systematic?

Q. Systematic.

24 A. Tell me what you mean by systematic.

Q. If you don't understand what I mean,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052

g	11	đ	•	•		_	đ	ŧ	*	•	ے	٠
3	•	4		•	11	_	- a	4	•	•	6	- 1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the question.

1 I'll ask you another question. In performing 2 content analysis, did you attempt to minimize 3 researcher subjectivity?

- 4 A. Again, I don't think that's relevant. That
 5 sounds very much like the earlier one and doesn't
 6 seem to apply to what I've done.
- Q. In performing your content analysis in this case, did you make any determination as to whether the articles that you considered to relate to cigarette smoking and health made an affirmative statement with regard to the relationship between cigarette smoking and health?

 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

THE WITNESS: Would you read the question again.

- Q. Maybe there's some confusion by the way I phrased it. Maybe I can clarify it. For the purpose of your content analysis, did you make any determination as to whether or not an article related eigerette smoking to disease?

 A. These were all articles that related
- cigarette smoking and health. Does that qualify?
- Q. Let me see if I can get it this way.
 Did you include in your content analysis articles

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
44
    Sudman - direct
    in which the summary questioned the relationship
    between cigarette smoking and disease?
 3
          Yes.
                Did you include in your content
 4
    analysis articles in which people refuted the
 5
    relationship between cigarette smoking and
    disease?
 8
          Yes.
                so to be included in your content
 9
          Q.
10
    analysis, the article did not specifically have to
    state that cigarette smoking is related to
11
              Is that right?
12
                MR. KEARNEY:
                              Objection to the form of
1:3
    the question.
14
          Articles that discussed digarette smoking
15
    and health were included regardless of the
16
    position -- the news article was an article that
17
    reported typically someone writing or saying
18
    something about this relationship.
19
                But the someone could be saying that
20
    cigarette smoking was unrelated to disease.
21
22
    Correct?
23
          Yes.
                 They could be saying that cigarette
24
```

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 070\$2 201-731-9668

smoking hadn't been proven to be related to

disease. Is that correct?

2 A. Yes.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. It could even in fact be statements
simply indicating that there was legislation
pending with regard to cigarette smoking. Is that
correct?

- A. No. That I thought was too indirect so I excluded those.
- Q. Did you include in your content analysis articles which simply indicated that there were studies being conducted with respect to cigarette smoking and whether it caused disease?

 A. If it was something that said a study would be done or that a study was in progress, no, it was not included. Only if there were results.
- g. Did you do any other work in the falmer case other than review the opinion surveys that you told us, review the indices that you told us and perform this content analysis and prepare Sudman Exhibit 1?
- A. I can't think of anything else at this time.
 - Q. In addition to the work that you performed in the Falmer case, did you do any new work in relationship to this case?

25 A. Yes, I have.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman	-	dir	e c	t
	_			

- What was that?
- I've looked at a number of other polls that 2 have been conducted in addition to those I looked 3 at in the Palmer case.
- Did you seek out those other polls? 5 ٥.
- Yes.

Palmer case.

1

14

19

25

- Why did you feel that it was necessary 7 to review those polls in this case and not in the falmer case?
- Objection to the form of MR. KEARNEY: 10 11 the question.
- The issues, as I understand them in this 12 case, are somewhat broader than they are in the 13
- What are the issues that are broader 15 in this case than in the Falser case?
- As I understand it, they relate to public 17 awareness of other kinds of relations with other 18 illnesses; with other diseases or they may.
- That necessitated looking at Q. 20 additional polls. Is that correct? 21
- Yes. 22
- What additional polls did you seek Q. 23
- 24 out, sir?
 - The polls I can remember looking at include

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

-	47 Sudman - direct
1	polls conducted for the Department of Health,
2	Education & Welfare, a series of polls conducted
3	for them, and in addition, there were polls
4	conducted for the Tobacco Institute and Philip
5	Morris and a poll conducted for the Federal Trade
6	Conmission or polls conducted for the Federal
7	Trade Commission.
8	g. pid you prepare any additional
9	writings or generate any typed or written
10	materials in this case?
11	A. There are some notes that I prepared.
12	Q. These computer sheets that you brought
13	here today, were these generated in the Palmer
14	case?
15	A. Yes.
16	THE WITNESS: Can we take a break
	whenever it's convenient?
17	MR. EDELL: We can take a break right
18	MR. EDELL! We can take a state
19	now.
20	(Short break.)
21	Q. In performing any of the work that you
22	did with respect to the Falzer case, did you have
23	assistance from anyone other than a lawyer or an
24	employee of any law firm?
	un printer. Chiection to the form of

48

Sudman - direct

- 1 the question.
- 2 A. No one other than myself.
- 3 Q. You didn't use a research assistant or
- 4 another colleague to help you. Is that correct?
- 5 A. I did not use a research assistant or a
- 6 colleague.
- 7 Q. Did you use anyone to help you in your
- 8 work that you performed in the Palmer case?
- 9 A. Secretarial.
- 10 Q. Was the secretarial help limited to
- 11 | typing?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. In regard to your work in this case,
- 14 did you receive any assistance from anyone?
- 15 A. Assistance?
- 6 Q. Assistance, help, aid.
- 17 A. The attorneys have helped me get some of the
- 8 material.
- 19 Q. What materials did the attorneys help
- 20 | you get?
- 21 A. Material which was not in the public domain,
- 22 | Tobacco Institute studies.
- 23 Q. Did you ask them to give you all
- 24 surveys that were performed or did they say here
- 25 are some surveys that we have gathered together

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
```

- 1 | that have been performed?
- 2 A. I don't remember how -- would you ask that
 3 question one more time?
- 4 Q. Sure. Did you go to Mr. Kearney or
- 5 | some other lawyer and say let me have all the
- 6 surveys that were ever conducted for the Tobacco
- 7 Institute or did he say Professor, here are some
- B studies that were performed for the Tobacco
- 9 | Institute?
- 10 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
- 11 | the question.
- 12 A. I don't think either one of those statements
- 13 characterizes exactly what was done.
- 14 Q. How did you know what opinion polls
- 15 existed which were not in the public domain?
- 16 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
- 17 | the question.
- 18 A. The attorneys informed me that there were
- 19 some polls that were available that had already
- 20 been introduced somehow into this case.
- 21 Q. Did you examine all of the polls that
- 22 they told you had somehow been introduced in this
- 23 case?
- 24 A. I tried to examine everything that was
- 25 available. Sitting here, it's conceivable I may

```
50
    Sudman - direct
    have missed something.
 2
                 All of the studies that you did review
 3
    had been provided in response to the subpoena.
    that correct?
 5
          I's sorry.
                       I don't really know.
 6
                 Who responded to the subpoena?
 7
          I don't know.
                MR. EDELL: Maybe you can clarify it
 9
    for him, Mr. Kearney.
10
                MR. KEARNEY:
                              All of the studies that
11
    we obtained from Professor Sudman were produced to
12
         It's my understanding that all of the
13
    studies that he has reviewed have been produced to
14
    you.
15
                MR. EDELL:
                             Were all of the studies
16
    that were provided to him produced in any way in
17
    this case?
18
                MR. KEARNEY:
                              Any study that he
19
    reviewed that were provided to him by me or which
20
    he got on his own was produced to you.
21
                MR. EDELL:
                             Thank you.
                In reviewing Sudman Exhibit 1, you
22
    use, for example, in the last full sentence of the
23
24
    first sentence, "In this report we summarize both
```

40\$ Northfield Avenue West Grange, N. J. 070\$2 201-731-9666

the direct and indirect measurements."

```
51
    Sudman - direct
 1
    just you?
                Editorial.
 2
 3
                Did you review any additional
    articles, newspaper articles or periodicals or any
    additional indices in your work in this case?
 5
                 I added several more years in the
 6
    eighties, the New York Times Index and the
7
 8
    Reader's Guide.
                why did you do that?
 9
          Q.
          The data existed and I received an
10
    indication that there might be some questions
11
12
    asked about.
                 MR. EDELL: Could you mark this,
13
14
15
                 (Sudman Exhibit 2 marked for
    identification.)
16
                 Professor Sudman, I show you what has
17
    been marked Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification.
18
    Can you tell us what that is, please.
19
           This entire set?
20
                .Yes.
21
           (Examining document.)
                                   I guess I would
22
    describe these in general as working notes that I
23
    prepared for my use in summarizing some of the
24
25
    data I examined.
```

1 Q. Look at the first page, please.

2 A. Yes.

3

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. What is that?

4 A. The title is number of articles on health dangers of cigarette smoking, New York Times and

6 Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature.

Q. You prepared that?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. What periodicals were included in your listing of articles that appeared in periodicals during the years 1948 through 1985?

12 A. You mean where it says Reader's Guide to

13 Periodicals? Yes.

included.

A. Those are all periodicals that are indexed in the Reader's Guide, essentially consumer articles. That is, professional journals are not

Q. Did you make any attempt to see what circulation the periodical had that contained articles concerning health dangers of cigarette smoking and which were listed in your first page of Sudman Exhibit 2?

A. I made no special effort to compute circulations but I noted that these were the major consumer magazines which have the largest

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 circulations.

- 2 How did you know that for 1948 or 1949
- 3 or 1950?
- 1948 and 1949 doesn't make any sense because
- 5 those are zero.
- 6 Then let's go to 1950.
- 7 For 1950 they were magazines like Life and
- My impression was that they had very large so on.
- 9 circulations.
- 10 Please turn to that portion of your
- notes where you begin listing for 1948 information 11
- 12 regarding the New York Times Index. Do you see
- 13 that, sir?
- 14 Yes, I do.
- There are two articles for 1948, 15
- from March 27 and the other for October 31. 16
- 17 that correct?
- 18 Yes.
- 19 Q.
- reflected on the first page of Sudman Exhibit 2? 20
- 21 On the first page?
- The two New York Times articles, yes. 22
- 23 Yes, the two.
- Are all of the articles which are 24
- summarized in your handwriting part of the summary

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

which appeared on the first page of Sudman Exhibit

2 27

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

4 the question. You can answer it.

5 A. I believe that's correct, yes.

6 Q. So, for example, take a look at the

7 second page of your handwritten summaries of the

New York Times Index.

9 A. Yes.

8

10 Q. For example, November 19, 1951, is it,

11 sir? Do you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. It says American Cancer Society plans

14 study, New Jersey, is that of smoking, as lung

15 | cancer cause?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. You listed that in the total of

18 articles for the year 1951. Is that correct?

19 A. That appears to be correct, yes.

20 Q. Is there any question in your mind as

21 to whether that's correct?

22 A. No. It has been a bit since I've done this

23 but that seems to be correct.

24 Q. Turn to the next page, for example,

25 for December 9, 1953. I'm trying to read your

wage and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

- l | handwriting and I misread this. Go down to May,
- 2 | is it 14 for 1953, Bellevue Medical Center,
- 3 Industrial Medicine Institute studies smoking and
- 4 | engine exhaust inhalations as lung growth cause?
- 5 \ \ \ Yes.
 - Q. Is that correct?
- 7 A. I think so, yes.
- 8 Q. Was that listed as one of the articles
- 9 appearing in 1953 and part of your summary which
- 10 is the first page of Sudman Exhibit 2?
- 11 A. I think so.
- 12 Q. Why did you include that, sir, as an
- 13 article regarding the health dangers of cigarette
- 14 smoking?
- 15 A. I'm trying to remember now. Obviously in
- 16 1985 I thought this fit.
- 17 Q. Let's go down to October 5, 1953,
- 18 Americans Surgeons College panel urges cigarette
- 19 | manufacturing companies finance study on suspected
- 20 link between smoking and lung growths. Was that
- 21 listed in your summary which is the first page of
- 22 | Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification?
- 23 A. I believe so, yes.
- 24 g. Why did you list that as an article on
- 25 health dangers of digarette smoking?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

	. 56
	Sudman - direct
1	A. Obviously at the time I thought it fit.
2	Q. Why is it, sir, that you made notes
3	with respect to certain articles and not others?
4	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
5	the question.
6	A. At some point as the number of articles
7	increased, I thought it would be easier to Xerox
8	the pages from the New York Times Index rather
9	than simply writing down what was going on and
0	then I switched at some point to Xeroxing the
1	pages.
2	 In performing this content analysis,
. 3	the only quantitative analysis that you performed
. 4	was the number of articles. Is that correct?
5	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
. 6	the question.
L 7	A. Yes.
L 8	g. You did no specific content analysis
19	with regard to the specific content of the
2 0	articles. Is that right, sir?
21	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
2 2	the question.
23	A. The subject is part of the content.
24	o. You didn't perform a content analysis

25

57 Sudman - direct Times for the years 1948 through 1985 which 1 2 concluded that cigarette sacking was a cause of 3 lung cancer. Is that right? MR. KEARNEY: Can I have the question 5 reread, please. 6 (Question read.) 7 The content analysis that I did was related to health in general and not just to lung cancer 9 and so I did not do something specifically to separate out lung cancer. 10 Did you do a content analysis of 11 Q. 12 articles in the New York Times which concluded that there was a relationship between digarette 13 smoking and health dangers? 14 15 That concluded? 16 Q. You want it read back, sir? 17 MR. KEARNEY: Let's have it read 18 back. 19 (Question read.) 20 Let me rephrase the question, sir. Did you do a content analysis to ascertain how 21 22 many articles appeared in the New York Times during the time period of 1948 through 1985 that 23

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

405 Northfield Avenue West Grange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

concluded that there were health dangers

associated with the use of cigarettes?

```
58
    Sudman - direct
 1
          No.
 2
          ٥.
                 Did you do a content analysis to
 3
    ascertain how many articles appeared in the New
    York Times during the time period 1948 through
 5
    1985 that questioned the relationship between
 6
    health dangers and cigarette smoking?
 7
                 MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
 8
    the question.
 9
          I simply did what you see in the notes,
10
    content analysis of the relationship between the
11
    health dangers of cigarette smoking and health.
12
                 MR. EDELL:
                             Could you read the
    question back for the witness.
13
14
                 (Question read.)
15
                 MR. KEARNEY: Do you have another
16
    question, Marc?
17
                 MR. EDELL:
                             I would like an answer to
18
    the question.
19
                 Did you or did you not perform such a
20
21
    content analysis, sir?
22
          That questioned the relationship?
23
                 THE WITHESS:
24
                        It's a long question.
```

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Grange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

MR. KEARNEY:

```
Sudman - direct
 1
                 (Question read.)
 2
           I did not.
 3
                 Do you know how many of all of these
    articles that are listed on the first page of
 5
    Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification related
    cigarette smoking to disease?
 7
                 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 8
    the question.
 9
          I'm sorry.
                     Is that a new question or is .
10
    that something I've answered?
11
                 This is a new question. Do you know
12
    how many of those articles appearing in the New
13
    York Times as summarized on the first page of
14
    Sudman Exhibit 2 related cigarette smoking to
15
    disease?
16
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
    the question. You can answer the question if you
17
18
    can understand it.
19
                MR. EDELL: He can't answer a question
    if he doesn't understand it.
20
                MR. KEARNEY: That's probably
21
22
23
                MR. EDELL: So why are you cueing your
24
    withess?
25
                MR. KEARNEY: I don't understand the
```

1 | question. He obviously doesn't understand. He

2 | doesn't understand whether this question is

3 different from an earlier question and you seem to

4 be satisfied with not clarifying it.

5 A. How do you mean related? I guess that's

6 what's causing me the problem.

7 Q. I'll clarify it. Thank you. How many

8 of these articles which you've totaled on the

9 first page of Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification

10 affirmatively relate digarette smoking to health

11 | dangers?

12 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

13 the question.

14 A. By affirmatively relate, would you perhaps

15 put that another way because I'm a little fuzzy.

16 Q. That there is possibly a relationship,

17 probably a relationship, definitely a relationship

18 as opposed to it hasn't been proven, we don't

19 know. Do you understand now?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Would you answer the question?

22 A. I don't know.

23 Q. With respect to the articles that you

24 listed on Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification,

25 where did the articles appear in the New York

waga and spinelii certified shorthand reporters

	· 61
	Sudman - direct
1	Times? The first page, the 30th page? Do you
2	have any idea?
3	A. I didn't tabulate that.
4	Q. That wasn't important for your
5	consideration?
6	A. I didn't tabulate that.
7	Q. Was it important for your
8	considerations in this matter?
9	A. That was not something I tabulated.
10	Q. I understand you didn't tabulate it.
11	Does that mean it wasn't important?
12	A. I didn't consider the issue of importance.
13	Q. Do you know how long any of these
14	articles were that you've summarized on Sudman
15	Exhibit 2 for identification, whether they were a
16	paragraph or two sentences or a whole page?
17	A. I didn't tabulate that either.
18	g. You didn't think that that was
19	important, necessary? Is that correct?

A. I didn't consider the issue of importance.

Q. I assume that you did everything that you thought was necessary in order to conclude or to come to your conclusions as expressed in the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

20

21

22

23

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

Objection to the form of

2017012993

```
Sudman - direct

1 report provided by the defendants on your behalf

2 and as appears in Sudman Exhibit 1 for

3 identification. Is that correct?

4 THE WITHESS: Would you read that

5 again, please?

6 Q. Sure. Did you do everything that you
```

- Q. Sure. Did you do everything that you thought was necessary in order to express those opinions which appeared in the report furnished by the defendants in this matter?
- A. I'm not sure I can answer that question. At some point obviously I stopped.
- Q. Did you think that you did everything that was necessary in order to support your opinions in this matter?
- 15 A. I don't think I made up my mind on that 16 issue at the moment I stopped.
 - Q. Is there anything that you still think you should do?
- 19 A. As of this moment, nothing occurs to me but
 20 something might occur to me that I might want to
 21 do.
 - Q. The articles that you listed on the first page of Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification, did those reflect consumer awareness concerning the health hazards associated with the use of

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

22

23

24

cicarettes?

1

2

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

3 | the question. .

A. These are input measures. The polls that I report on are the measures which reflect on

6 consumer awareness.

. Q. What's an input measure, sir?

A. Feople have to find out about something from somewhere. Where they find out are input

10 | measures.

Q. Can you by examining the articles that are listed on the first page of Sudman Exhibit 2 as having appeared in the New York Times conclude what consumer awareness was during the various years listed on that page?

A. No. That's what the polls are for.

Q. Is there any academic discipline that you are aware of that would permit an individual to review the New York Times articles listed in Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification and conclude what consumer awareness was at the various points in time listed on that paper?

THE WITNESS: Can I hear the question again, please.

(Question read.)

waga and spinelli certifled shorthand reporters

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

2 | the question.

1

3 A. Obviously different disciplines use

4 information from the New York Times for their

5 purposes. I just don't know what they would do

6 with it.

7 Q. What academic disciplines are you

8 aware of that would permit one to draw conclusions

9 with respect to consumer awareness of the health

10 hazards associated with the use of cigarettes

11 based upon a review of the New York Times articles

12 listed on Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification?

13 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

14 the question.

15 A. I just don't know.

16 Q. Am I correct that the reason that you

17 | made an examination of the index to the New York

18 Times was to verify the information reflected in

19 | the polls? Is that correct?

20 A. Well, that's close. Basically it was in a

21 | sense to provide an alternative measure which was

22 | independent of the polls which might then be used

23 to demonstrate that the polls had basically gotten

24 it right.

25

MR. EDELL: Could you read the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
65
    Sudman - direct
    response back, please.
 2
                 (Answer read.)
 3
                What did your content analysis of the
    index to stories in the New York Times measure?
 5
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 6
    the question.
 7
          Is this a new question?
                                    I thought it was
    something I had already answered.
9
                Would you answer the question, sir?
10
                MR. KEARNEY: Let's have the question
11
    reread.
12
                 (Question read.)
13
             neasured the number of stories that were
14
    in the New York Times that were related, that had
    both a discussion of cigarettes and health in the
15
16
    story.
17
                Do the opinion surveys also measure
    how many articles appeared in the New York Times
18
19
    which related to digarette smoking and health?
20
               They measure opinions, attitudes,
21
    behavior.
22
                There were no handwritten notes that I
       at least, and please correct me if I'm wrong,
23
    suggarizing what appeared in the Reader's Guide to
24
```

Periodicals.

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-8668

Is that correct?

```
66
 1
          No.
 2
                 Where are the notes?
 3
                     pages at the back where this is
    the pages at the back relate to the Reader's
 5
 6
    Guide.
 7
                 for example, for 1949 through 1950,
    you have a listing of Science Digest.
8
          I will have to find that. I'll have to see
9
    where that is. Yes, I see that.
10
                 12th from the back.
11
12
                 MR. EDELL: Let's mark that as Sudman
13
    Exhibit 2A.
14
                 (Sudman Exhibit 2% marked for
    identification.)
15
16
                 Do you want to make
    something you said before the break or after the
17
18
    break?
                 MR. KEARNEY:
                               I object to that.
19
          I really don't remember.
20
21
22
    morning break or whether it was after the morning
23
24
          No, I can't remember whether it was before
25
```

l or after.

Q. Was this correction something that you

3 discussed with counsel?

A. No.

Q. Then why don't you make the

6 | correction.

7 A. It's something which in fact you generated.

8 I said I think at some point that I had not used

9 proposed studies in counting the number of stories

10 | that related cigarette smoking and health and you

11 demonstrated to me by a series of questions you

12 asked that I obviously did include proposed

13 studies as well as studies that had actually been

14 | conducted, so it has been now awhile and until you

15 reminded me, I hadn't remembered including studies

16 where the study was proposed so those are also in.

17 Q. Thank you for clarifying that. Take a

18 look at Sudman Exhibit 2A, please. During the

19 | year 1949 through 1950, you list Science Digest as

20 | the first entry?

21 A. Yes.

22

24

Q. What is Science Digest, sir?

23 A. It's a magazine. These are all magazines.

Q. I understand that. What's its

25 | circulation?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
68
    Sudman - direct
          I don't know.
                Do you know whether it's something
    that's read by most people or whether it's read by
    people with specific interests?
                MR. KEARNEY: Object to the form.
5
          I don't know who the readers of Science --
6
    it is one of the magazines included in the
                      It is not a specialized.
    Reader's Guide.
               It's one of general circulation.
                Have you ever read it?
10
11
          Yes.
                                          Christian
                 Take a look under 1952.
12
    Century is that?
13
14
                 Is that something that you see on your
15
16
    newsstand all the time?
                 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
17
18
    the question.
                 Sir?
19
          Christian Century?
20
21
22
                 Is that something you usually read?
23
           po I usually read it?
24
                                            I can't read
                 would you turn the page.
25
```

```
69
    Sudman - direct
    some of this so maybe you can help me.
 2
    first entry?
 3
          It looks to me like Scientific American.
                 What's the next one?
 5
          American Mercury.
 6
                It's another one of the popular
 7
    periodicals?
 8
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
 9
    the question.
10
                MR. PARRISH:
                               Object to the form of
11
    the question.
          ٥.
                Is that correct?,
12
13
          In 1954 it was a circulated among the
14
    general public. It was included in Reader's
15
    Guide.
16
                Do you know what the demographics of
    its readership was?
17
          I don't know what the demographics of the
18
    readership of any of these magazines are.
19
20
                Why is it, sir, that you didn't
    prepare any summaries of the articles for any of
21
    the articles that were listed in the Reader's
22
23
    Guide?
          I counted the articles.
24
25
                You didn't summarize them, is that
```

70

Sudman - direct

1 correct, as you did with some of the New York

2 Is that right?

3 Yes.

Was there a reason?

5 I'm trying to remember. It has been a

couple of years. My memory tells me that the

Reader's Guide is very readily available and I

felt that if it were necessary, one could always

9 go back and get the information.

How many of these articles listed 10

under the column Reader's Guide to Periodicals on 11

Sudman Exhibit 2 for identification affirmatively 12

relate the use of cigarettes to health dangers?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 14

15 the question.

I don't know. 16

How many of the articles listed under 17

the column Reader's Guide to Periodicals on Sudman 18

2 for identification questions the relationship 19

between cigarette smoking and health dangers? 20

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 21

22 the question.

23

I don't know.

How many of the articles listed under 24

the column Reader's Guide to Periodicals on Sudman 25

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
71
    Sudman - direct
    2 for identification simply relate that there are
    proposed studies with respect to the health
    dangers of cigarette smoking?
          I don't know,
 5
                Have you ever previously conducted a
    content analysis prior to the work that you did in
 7
    this and the Palmer case?
 8
          Yes.
                Can you tell us about any such content
9
10
    analysis?
11
          I told you earlier --
12
          Q.
                You told me you wrote a paper.
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Object.
13
                                        Let him answer
14
    the question, please.
                          Don't interrupt him in the
15
    middle of an answer.
                Can you just, before you continue,
16
17
    this may be in direct contravention to Mr.
    Kearney's statement, where does that article
18
    appear on the curriculum vitae that we have been
19
    furnished in this case?
20
          (Examining document.)
                                  Shall I read you or
21
22
    point to it?
                    KEARNEY: He just asked where.
23
                You can just check it off with a red
24
```

25

pen.

1 A. (Complying.)

8

9

10

11

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Other than your work in the Palmer

case and the work you performed in this case and

this one article that you've checked off and read

on your January 1987 curriculum vitae, what other

content analysis have you performed?

7 A. I can't think of any at this time.

Q. What was the purpose of the content analysis that you performed which was included in this paper entitled "Sample surveys" which you checked off on your curriculum vitae?

12 A. It was to measure how important survey
13 research had become as a research tool.

Q. What materials did you perform a content analysis of?

A. I chose leading journals in the social sciences.

18 Q. Did you simply count the number of 19 articles?

A. I counted the number of articles that contained survey research methodology.

Q. Did you do a content analysis of this specific information contained in these various articles?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
1
   the question.
2
```

5

6

7

8

9

15

Sudman - direct

I counted -- yes, that was a content analysis of did they contain information that indicated that survey research had been conducted.

MR. EDELL: Let's take a break.

(Short break.)

- You talked about questionnaires before, Professor Sudman. How do you know whether questionnaire is a good one, a bad one?
- 10 Where shall I start?
- 11 Q. Start from the beginning.
- MR. KEARNEY: How about with an 12 objection to the form of the question. 13
- 14 To start with, obviously you can't know whether a questionnaire is a good one or a bad one

16 unless you know what it's intended to do.

- 17 of all, one has to know what the purpose is of the
- 18 questionnaire. If it doesn't achieve that
- 19 purpose, it's a bad one.
- 20 How do you ascertain whether or not it does or doesn't achieve the purpose of the survey 21
- 22 that you intend to conduct?
- Assuming I were asked to ascertain whether 23 the questionnaire achieves the purpose, somebody 24
- would have to tell me what the purpose is.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

İ

2 questionnaire and ascertain what its purpose is?

3 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

Should you be able to look at a

4 the question.

1

5 A. That's so general that -- sometimes yes and

6 sometimes no.

7 Q. If it's a good questionnaire, if it's

8 a questionnaire that has been prepared properly in

9 order to inquire into an intended purpose, should

10 you as an expert in survey research be able to

11 | read the questions and conclude what the intended

12 purpose of the questionnaire was?

13 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

14 the question.

16

15 A. Again I think that's so general I don't

know. Sometimes yes and sometimes not.

17 Q. Depending upon what, sir?

18 A. You give me a specific questionnaire and we

19 could -- there are just so many other --

20 Q. Let me see if I can give you a

21 specific questionnaire. Let's take a look at this

22 questionnaire.

23 A. (Examining document.)

24 Q. This is Neadle Exhibit 1 for

25 identification.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

- A. What's the question?
- Q. Can you tell me the purpose of the study for which that questionnaire was devised?
- A. No.
- Q. Can you tell me whether or not any of the questions would elicit information with regard to beliefs concerning cigarette smoking and any health hazards?
- 9 A. Yes, there are questions which could elicit information on beliefs.
- 11 Q. Which questions are those, sir?
- 12 A. Number three.
- 13 Q. How would that elicit information 14 concerning beliefs regarding any health risks 15 associated with cigarette smoking?
- 16 A. The question reads: "Among 100 cigarette
 17 smoker, how many of them do you think will get
- 18 lung cancer because they smoke?" That seems to
- 19 have something to do with smoking and lung
- 20 cancer. It seems to be obtaining what I think of
- 21 as a belief.
- 22 Q. Would question number three similarly
- 23 elicit information concerning knowledge regarding
- 24 cigarette smoking and disease?
- 25 A. Yes

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Would it similarly reflect attitude 1 2 with respect to cigarette smoking and disease?

3 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

5 Tell me how you differentiate attitude and belief here.

You just used those four terms previously, sir, attitude, belief, behavior and awareness, and I thought there was a reason why you differentiated between them. If there's no difference, fine, tell me.

I don't think in this particular situation -- normally when one thinks of an attitude, it's something that has been well formulated in advance of the question and it's not obvious that people have thought about this question sufficiently to have a firm attitude on

If the respondent indicated "don't know" and simply provided his or her best guess, would that best guess reflect the respondent's beliefs with respect to digarette smoking and risk

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

25 the question.

> waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 A. I think it reflects what it says, best 2 guess.

Q. Is a best guess different than what their opinion is concerning the risk of digarette smoking and disease?

6 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- A. A best guess is a best guess.
- questions, "Among 100 cigarette smokers, how many of them do you think will get lung cancer because they smoke" and separate the second part into an additional question, "If you don't know, just your best guess will do." You wouldn't separate it on a questionnaire. Is that correct, sir?

 A. If indeed the coding of this question indicates that the answer followed the probe, essentially that's been done. I don't know how
- Q. If the coding was not such that the response would be noted as following the probe, would you have broken it down into separate questions?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

this question was coded.

followed a probe.

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 A. The method that's used here is a standard
2 procedure that's often used. The standard
3 procedure also is to indicate that the answer

5 Q. How would that be reflected in any 6 tabular results of such a study?

7 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 8 the question.

9 A. My preference would be to show separately
10 the people who answered the question before the
11 probe and then those who answered it after the
12 probe.

Q. Why is that?

A. You can always then add them up but then you would have the additional information of the people who answered with a probe.

Q. How is that information, specifically in regard to this question, helpful?

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

A. It depends on the purpose of the survey.

Q. If I wanted to know what people's beliefs were with regard to the risk of developing lung cancer from digarette smoking, would it be helpful to break the responses down into pre-probe

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
79
    Sudman - direct
    and post-probe?
 1
 2
                 MR. KEARNEY:
 3
    helpful?
          Q.
                 Helpful in any manner.
 5
                      Depending again on the purpose of
       survey, it might be useful to do that.
 7
                 In what manner would it be useful?
 8
          It depends on what purposes you have.
 9
                 My purpose is to ascertain what
          ٥.
10
    people's beliefs are with respect to cigarette
11
    smoking and disease.
12
          Why?
13
                 Why is that important?
          Simply to state it -- I guess I'm not able
14
15
    to answer the question?
16
                 To see what their level of awareness
17
    is.
18
                 MR. KEARNEY:
                                I object to the form of
19
    the question.
                    Now you are changing the whole
20
    thing.
21
    whole thing.
22
23
          Let's start again.
                 For the purposes of litigation,
24
    specifically this litigation, I want to know what
```

```
Sudman - direct
    people's beliefs are regarding cigarette smoking
 1
 2
    and disease. Would it be helpful to break up the
 3
    responses to question three by identifying which
 4
    responses followed the probe?
 5
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 6
    the question.
 7
          I don't know.
 8
                Under what circumstances would it be
 9
    helpful to break up the responses by listing those
10
    responses before the probe and those after?
11
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
```

MR. EDELL: Now I'm sure we won't get

Q. But go ahead.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the question.

that. I guess I'm not going to be able to answer that. I guess my sense is that there are some situations where it would be useful to split these into two parts but again I would have to have the specifics and then make a decision and sometimes I might not be able to make the decision as to whether it was or wasn't useful.

Q. What other specifics would you need in order to answer that question in the context of this question?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
```

- 1 A. Again, it's the purpose of the survey.
- 2 Q. To see whether or not people had to be
- 3 warned about the health hazards.
- 4 A. But again, that's a general enough statement
- 5 so that -- sitting here right now, I guess I'm not
- 6 able to answer that.
- 7 Q. Is there a difference, sir, between a
- 8 respondent answering question number three before
- 9 the probe and after the probe with respect to the
- 10 extent of their knowledge regarding the risk of
- 11 developing lung cancer?
- 12 A. I don't know. Without having done this, I
- 13 | don't know.
- 14 Q. What would you have to look at in
- 15 order to make that determination?
- 16 A. The data.
- 17 Q. In other words, you'd have to look at
- 18 the results of the survey?
- 19 A. Or other surveys where this question had
- 20 been used or semething of this kind.
- 21 Q. What if you were devising the survey,
- 22 sir? If somebody came to you and said look, I've
- 23 got this questionnaire and I want a second
- 24 opinion, you are an expert on survey research,
- 25 what do you think of this questionnaire?

Sudman - direct

- A. The standard method we use is to pretest.
- 2 Q. So you wouldn't have any comments
 3 regarding this questionnaire until you pretest
- 4 it. Is that correct?

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- 5 A. I might have some comments.
 - Q. Let's assume that we didn't get to the point of pretesting it. Would you have any comments with respect to question number three?

9 MR. KEARNEY: Comments about what? I 10 object to the form of the question.

- Q. With regard to the question itself insofar as the issue of obtaining what knowledge people had concerning cigarette smoking and the risks of developing disease.
- A. Again, assuming that I knew what the purpose was, I might or might not have comments.
 - Q. I thought I just told you what the purpose was.
 - MR. KEARNEY: You keep changing the hypothetical.
- 21 MR. EDELL: Let's make it real easy.
 - Q. The purpose of conducting the study is to ascertain the level of knowledge concerning cigarette smoking and the risks of developing lung cancer. That's the purpose of the study. I want

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

- 1 to find that out. I have someone who prepares
- 2 question number three. Do you think that it would
- 3 be important to differentiate between pre- and
- 4 | post-probe responses?
- 5 A. Again, although you obviously think that now
- 6 you expressed fully the purpose of the study, it's
- 7 still a study which is still fuzzy in my mind. I
- 8 don't know why it's being done and in that case,
- 9 my answer is possibly it might be important to
- 10 differentiate and it may not be important to
- 11 differentiate.
- 12 Q. Depending upon what?
- 13 A. Depending upon previous knowledge. Has this
- 14 | question been used before?
- 15 Q. Never been used before.
- 16 A. In that case, certainly I would want to
- 17 pre-test it and you are asking for a judgment
- 18 | before a pre-test?
- 19 . Q. Yes.
- 20 A. I guess I'll defer my judgment until after I
- 21 | see some pretest results.
- 22 g. What would you look at in the pretest
- 23 | results to determine whether or not it should be
- 24 broken down into pre- and post-probe responses?
- 25 A. Is it the case that many people say don't

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
84
    Sudman - direct
    know? If it turns out that virtually no one says
 1
    don't know, that would be one answer.
                                            If many
 2
 3
    people do, that might be another.
         Q.
                How would you know whether or not
 4
    someone said I don't know?
 6
          You would want, you think in the pretest, to
 7
    get pre- and post-measures.
 8
          Q.
                Why, sir?
          I thought I just answered that.
9
                 I don't think you did, respectfully...
10
          So that one could see how many people had
11
    said don't know.
12
                From this questionnaire, there is no
13
    place to record don't know, is there, sir?
14
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
15
16
    the question.
          An X marked by a probe would be an
17
    indication of that.
18
                 But if the interviewer was not given
19
    instructions to differentiate between a response
20
    which was pre- and post-probe on this
21
    questionnaire, you wouldn't be able to look at the
22
    pretest results and make any decisions with regard
23
    to whether it would be helpful to break it up or
24
          Isn't that right?
```

```
85
    Sudman - direct
 1
          You are setting up the rules.
 2
                 Right.
                         Assuming that is so.
 3
          If the interviewer were told not to do what
    is normally done, then you might get the result
5
    that you expect.
6
                How does an interviewer know to
 7
    differentiate between pre- and post-probe
8
    responses?
9
          It's part of standard training at our shop.
10
                You would expect a pretest to identify
    pre- and post-probe responses.
                                     Is that correct?
11
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection.
12
                                            You mean in
13
    all cases?
                MR. EDELL:
14
                             Normally.
15
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Object to the form of
16
    the question.
          I would expect that these answers, that a
17
    pretest would demonstrate what the answers are to
18
19
    this question, yes.
20
          Q.
                 Both pre-probe and post-probe.
```

were followed, yes.

21

22

23

24

Correct?

the question.

408 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9556

Objection to the form of

MR. KEARNEY:

If it were done? If the standard procedures

It would be standard procedure at least according to you for there to be a pre-probe and post-probe differentiation with regard to the responses. Is that correct? In the pretest.

- I don't know whether it would be standard or I would do it. not.
- 7 Why would you do it?
- I think I've answered that question but let 8
- answer it again. So that one could see how 10 many had been answered pre-probe and how many had
- been answered post-probe. 11
- Why is that important? 12
- It may not be important. 13
- But why may it be important? 14
- 15 You might want to see whether or not the probe is necessary. I guess it's a little bit, it 16 may or may not be important but it's just a useful 17 thing to check out as part of the understanding of 18
- 19 the question.
- What if the overwhelming number of 20
- 21 responses were post-probe as opposed to
- pre-probe? What would that reflect in regard to 22
- this question? 23
- MR. KEARNEY: 24 Objection to the form of
- 25 the question.

	Sudman - direct
1	A. It would depend on what the answers are
2	pre-probe. I guess I don't know the answer to
3	that.
4	Q. The only answer pre-probe would be
5	don't know. Right? On question three? If they
6	were to answer a post-probe question.
Ī	
7	A. Is everyone answering don't know?
8	Q. I'm saying 50 percent of the people
9	who are interviewed say don't know and they then
0	go on to the probe question as to what their best
. 1	guess was. Okay?
2	A. All right.
. 3	Q. Of what significance would that be
. 4	with regard to this question?
. 5	A. It would indicate that a very substantial
. 6	fraction of people don't know or say they don't
.7	know when asked the question.
. 8	Q. Were you aware that there was a survey
. 9	conducted by Audits & Surveys with regard to this
. 0	litigation?
11	A. Yes.
22	g. When did you become aware of that?
23	A. Sometime in the past month.

Exhibit 1 prior to today?

- A. I don't remember having seen it.
- 2 Q. Did you see the questionnaires used by
- 3 Audits & Surveys?
- 4 A. Pardon me?
- 5 Q. Did you see the questionnaire used by
- 6 Audits & Surveys with regard to the survey that
- 7 you understand they performed in this litigation?
- 8 A. Before today.
- 9 Q. Before today.
- 10 A. No, I don't remember having seen it.
- 11 Q. What, if anything, did you see with
- 12 regard to the survey performed by Audits & Surveys
- 13 | concerning work that they performed in this
- 14 | litigation?
- 15 A. I don't think I saw anything.
- 16 Q. What were you advised concerning such
- 17 | surveys performed by Audits & Surveys?
- 18 A. I was told that such a survey existed.
- 19 Q. Did you ask for any information
- 20 regarding the survey?
- 21 A. I have been looking at so many surveys that
- 22 I really can't remember this specific one apart
- 23 from all these others.
- 24 Q. Other than a survey performed by
- 25 Audits & Surveys, are you aware of any other

```
89
    research survey performed specifically with regard
 1
 2
 3
                 Did you review Neadle Exhibit 10 for
    identification?
          (Examining document.)
                                   I think I did see
 7
    this at some point.
 8
                 When?
9
          Sometime in the last several weeks.
10
                 Did you see it yesterday or the day
    before?
11
12
13
14
             was at a meeting with the attorneys for
15
16
    Webster & Sheffield.
                 When did that meeting occur?
17
          I think I've answered that.
18
19
20
          Yes.
                 How many times did you meet with
21
22
    for this deposition in the last several weeks?
23
24
25
```

3

. 7

A

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 A. Here in New York.

Q. pid you discuss with them the validity of the results reflected in Neadle Exhibit 10?
A. I think my comment was that in looking at this briefly, the results seem to be consistent with other surveys that I had seen conducted.

- Q. Which of the surveys that you reviewed in the context of formulating your opinions in this case reflected people's knowledge regarding the health hazards associated with cigarette smoking?
- A. I'm not going to be perfect on my memory, but as I remember it, the Gallup studies related to knowledge, the studies done by HEW related to knowledge, those done by Roper for the Tobacco Institute my memory tells me related to knowledge, the studies done by the FTC, and I guess this one have something to do with knowledge.
- Q. What was the the purpose of the Gallup surveys which reflected people's knowledge regarding the risks of cigarette smoking?

 A. Are you asking me what the purpose of Gallup polls are?
- Q. You told me before how important it is to understand the purpose or intent of a study and

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

I'm trying to find out what was the purpose or intent of the Gallup polls with regard to the issue of knowledge of the health hazards of cigarette smoking.

MR. KEARNEY: Object to the form of the question.

- A. The purpose of the Gallup polls is to provide information to all the subscribers of the Gallup service that they can then print in their newspapers about issues of public interest.
- Q. How do you determine whether or not the questionnaires are or are not appropriate for the intended purpose of the study, specifically with regard to Gallup, if you don't know the specific purpose of the study?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- 18 A. When you say you, you mean how do I?
- 19 Q. Yes, you
- 20 A. Well, in general there are a variety of
 21 things. First Gallup has a long-term reputation
 22 of providing useful, reliable information to the
 23 American public on a whole series of public
- 24 issues. The whole thrust of their work is to
 25 present data that are reliable and accurate. I

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
92
    Sudman - direct
    presenting this data as far as I can tell, they
 1
    have no axes to grind.
 2
                             They have a long-term
    reputation for testing questionnaires. They
 3
    always do careful pretest and test question
    wording.
              My sense is in general, unless there's
    something -- I won't say every Gallup question
 7
    that's ever been asked is perfect but in general
 8
    the Gallup questions are highly regarded. .
. 9
                MR. KEARNEY: When you are at a
10
    convenient breaking point soon, since it appears
11
    to be close to our luncheon break.
                MR. EDELL: Sure.
12
                Assuming that you saw question number
13
    three on a Gallup poll, number three of Neadle
14
    Exhibit 1, and understanding the purpose of Gallup
15
16
    polls, would you have any opinions with respect to
    the question and whether or not it should have
17
18
    been broken down into two separate parts, both
    pre-probe and post-probe?
19
20
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
21
    the question.
22
          As far as I know, I don't remember Gallup
    having asked this.
23
```

It's a hypothetical question, sir.

You are saying if Gallup did ask it, what

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

Sudman - direct

2

1 would I think of it?

Q. Yes.

3 A. I don't know.

Q. What would you have to know in order to formulate an opinion as to what you would think of that question number three and whether it should have been broken down into two questions, both pre- and post-probe responses?

9 A. You are asking me a hypothetical question.

10 I haven't thought about it in advance. I don't

11 have an opinion on it.

12 Q. How long would it take you to

.13 formulate an opinion, sir?

14 A. If Gallup asked the question and I examined

15 the question, I might or might not have an opinion

16 at that time. As of now, I don't have an opinion

17 on it.

18 Q. I want you to assume that the question

19 was asked by Gallup and I want you to assume that

20 you read the question.

21 MR. KEARNEY: Objection. Asked and

22 answered

24

23 A. I don't have an opinion on it.

Q. I would like for you to formulate an

opinion, sir. Take a look at the question, -

wage and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
94
    Sudman - direct
    assuming that hypothetical, and give
    opinion.
 3
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection.
    answered.
 5
          I don't feel qualified sitting here trying
    to imagine how I would think if Gallup had asked
 7
    this question.
                    I guess my imagination fails me
    and I can't answer the question.
 8
 9
                MR. EDELL:
                            Let's break for lunch.
10
                (Luncheon recess.)
11
                AFTERNOON
12
                Professor Sudman, what is your
13
    definition of belief in the context of your use of
    that term in this case?
15
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Are you referring to the
16
    expert report?
17
                            Wherever he uses it.
                MR. KEARNEY: Why don't you show him
18
    the expert report. Wouldn't that be clearer
19
20
    instead of saying wherever he uses belief?
21
                MR. EDELL: He has used those terms
    during the course of the deposition.
22
    to show him other portions of the deposition where
23
    he distinguished between them.
24
                               Just trying to be
```

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 97052 201-731-9565

MR. KEARNEY:

Sudman - direct helpful. Go ah

1 helpful. Go ahead.

Q. Can you give us your definition of belief in the context of your use of it as an expert in survey research?

A. As I'm using the term, it refers to a view that one holds about a characteristic of a person or a product either in general or for some specific attribute of that person or product.

Q. How are beliefs formed?

A. I'm not an expert in belief formation.

Q. Does that mean you don't know?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

the question.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. Do you want my expert opinion on belief formation? I don't have an expert opinion on belief formation.

Q. What is your definition of awareness in the context of your use of that term as an expert in survey research?

A. By awareness, I operationalize the term in terms of people having first of all having heard or seen about a person or product or issue and then having talked about that person, product or issue with someone else, made up their mind about what they think about the person, product or issue

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
96
    Sudman - direct
    or its dimensions prior to the time that the
    question is asked.
 3
               .MR. EDELL: Could you read that back
    to me, please.
                (Answer read.)
                So it's a multistage process
 7
    awareness, sir?
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
    the question.
                Heard or seen about it and talked
10
    about it, then make up their mind.
11
12
    correct?
          Some of these can go on simultaneously.
13
14
                But for the purpose of your definition
    of awareness, it's a three-step process regardless
    of whether or not it can occur simultaneously?
16
17
          I haven't operationalized it in terms of
    steps. I've operationalized it in terms of
    intensity of awareness.
                Let's take a look at Neadle Exhibit 1
20
    for identification, sir. Take a look at question
    two.
22
          (Examining document.)
24
                Does that question seek to elicit the
    respondent's awareness regarding those four
25
```

statements? 1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- It appears that this is what it's trying to It's trying to elicit awareness.
- Would a response to question number two reflect whether or not a respondent has made 5 up his or her mind with respect to any of those statements?
 - I don't think so.
 - Would an answer to question number two reflect whether or not someone had talked about any of those four statements?
- It says which of Except indirectly. the following ideas have you heard about, and one of the ways of hearing is by talking with someone so it's not, it's a possible indirect measure but not a direct measure. 16
- So that question only would elicit a 17 certain portion of that information which you have 18 identified as being encompassed by the term 19 Is that correct? 20
- My definition, yes. 21
- Is your definition of awareness the 22 definition commonly used by experts in the field. of survey research?
- It's my working definition. I don't know. 25

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

6

7

8

22

- 1 I don't know what others use. There's probably
 2 some variability in definition of awareness.
- 3 Q. Do you know whether or not your
 4 definition of awareness is one commonly accepted
 5 by members of your profession?
 - A. I don't know the answer to that.
 - Q. What is your definition of attitude in the context of survey research?
- 9 A. Well, I'm just trying to think whether prior 10 to your asking this question I had ever defined 11 the term attitude. I think maybe I can better 12 talk about some of the characteristics of an
- 13 attitude rather than defining it because I really 14 haven't in my mind defined it.
- 15 Q. You have no definition in the context
 16 of survey research of the term attitude. Is that
 17 correct?
- 18 A. I have not defined the term.
- 19 Q. Does it have any meaning in the
- 20 | context of survey research?
- 21 A. I believe it does.
 - Q. What's its meaning?
- 23 A. Again, it's my sense that there's a good
- 24 deal of uncertainty about the use of that word and
- 25 different people may use it in different ways, so

```
99
    Sudman - direct
 1
    I can only tell you what it means to me.
 2
                What is that, sir?
 3
          An attitude is something which has been
    formed over a period of time, is not simply a
 5
    response that occurs when a person is asked a
    question but is something that had been in that
    person's mind earlier and it's a feeling about a
 7
    person, product or thing which may be possible,
    that is, good feelings about something or good
9
10
    feelings about something or feelings of fright, a
11
    wide range of attitudes towards a person, product
    or issue.
12
13
                How are attitudes formed?
          I'm not an expert on attitude formation.
14
15
                Does attitude formation have anything
    to do with the field of consumer behavior?
16
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
17
18
    the question.
          Does attitude formation have anything to do
19
    with the field of consumer behavior? I'm going to
20
21
    page on that one, too. Attitudes are part of
    consumer behavior. Attitude formation may or may
22
23
    not be.
```

Depending upon what or you just don't

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

25

know?

1 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

2 | the question.

3 A. Depending on a wide range of things and

4 especially whether the behavior is consumer

5 behavior.

6 Q. If we are talking about a consumer's

7 attitude with respect to a product, does the field

of consumer behavior relate in any way to attitude

formation?

12

10 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

11 the question. May I please have it read back.

(Question read.)

13 A. It's not an area in which I have any

14 expertise. I guess I just don't know.

15 Q. If we are concerned with a consumer's

16 beliefs with respect to a particular product, is

17 the formation of those beliefs related in any way

18 to the field of consumer behavior?

19 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

20 the question.

21 A. I don't have any expertise on that question.

22 . g. Were you furnished with any public

23 relations documents, any of the cigarette

24 manufacturers' public relations documents?

25 A. I'm not sure what you mean. Do you have

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
101
    Sudman - direct
    anything you want to show me?
    you mean by public relations document.
                Did you see any proposals with respect
    to public relations?
 5
          Proposals?
                Proposals.
          From whom to whom?
 8
          Q.
                Hill & Knowlton.
 9
          No.
                Did you see any internal public
10
          Q.
    relations proposals or reports of the Tobacco
11
    Institute?
12
          You mean from the Tobacco Institute to
13
    somebody else?
14
15
                It could be an internal document from
    someone within the Tobacco Institute, a document
16
    generated by the Tobacco Institute and sent to one
17
    of its members.
18
19
          No.
20
                Did you see any motivational research
    conducted by any one of the cigarette
21
    manufacturers or someone hired to perform such
22
    research on their behalf?
23
        will you tell me what you mean by
24
    motivational research there?
```

Q. Did you ever hear of the term 2 motivational research?

A. Yes.

3

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

4 Q. Is it a term that's commonly used in 5 marketing?

6 A. I don't have an opinion on the term
7 commonly. It's a term that has been used. I just
8 don't know how common.

9 Q. What's your definition of motivational 10 research?

11 A. · Motivational research is research which
12 involves doing depth interviews with respondents
13 using psychological theories.

14 Q. Did you see any such research in this 15 case?

A. I saw no studies that were specifically labeled motivational research.

Q. Did you see any motivational research studies, sir?

A. I saw studies that had been conducted by Roper for Philip Morris which by some definitions might be in that category.

Q. By your definition would the surveys that you saw performed by the Roper organization for Philip Morris be considered motivational

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct research? 2 I didn't make that judgment. I'm not an expert on motivational research and until you've 3 asked me the question right now, the thought never 5 occurred to me whether it was or wasn't. You don't have an opinion in regard to 6 whether the surveys were or were not motivational 7 Is that correct? research. I do not as of now, as of this minute. 9 you want to show me one and give me a chance to 10 examine it, I'll think about it but I certainly 11 have not formed an opinion, no. 12 pid you see any internal marketing 13 documents of any of the cigarette manufacturers? 14 Again, would you help me out and tell me 15 16 what you mean by that? Do you know what a marketing survey

is, sir? 18 19 Yes.

What is a marketing survey?

A marketing survey is a survey which has 21 been conducted in regard to marketing of a 22

specific product or brand. 23

Q.

17

20

24

25

Did you see any such surveys performed by or at the request of any of the cigarette

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
104
    Sudman - direct
    manufacturers in this case?
          Again I think the Roper studies for Philip
 2
 3
    Morris might fall into that category.
                 Other than the Roper studies, did you
 5
    see any such marketing surveys?
          None that I can remember as of now.
 6
                Did you see any results of any focus
7
    groups?
 8
 9
          Conducted by whom?
10
                By anybody.
          I believe there was a focus group which was
11
    conducted for the Federal Trade Commission that
12
    related to warnings on cigarette packages that I
13
    did look at.
14
                 was that the one performed by Burke?
15
          I can't remember right now who conducted it.
16
                 Other than that, did you see any other
17
    focus group studies?
18
          I don't remember any others at this time.
19
                             Would you mark this,
                 MR. EDELL:
20
21
    please.
                 (Sudman Exhibit 3 marked for .
22
    identification.)
23
                 Would you tell us what Sudman, 3
24
           (Examining document.)
                                   There is no simple
25
```

l way to describe this document in its totality.

2 It's a series of notes on separate surveys that I

3 took as I examined them. We can go through and I

4 can talk about the separate ones but it's not a

5 | single collection, all related to one thing.

Q. Other than Sudman 2 and Sudman 3, do
 You have any other notes with respect to your work

8 in the Palmer and/or the Cipollone case? Sudman 1

9 also has some of your notes. I'm sorry.

10 A. I've tried to put them all together as I had

11 them available. In going through right now, I

12 won't swear there's not a page missing but as far

13 as I know, this is the collection.

14 Q. How did you decide what questions to

15 include in your notes which have been marked as

16 Sudman 3?

17 A. I quess, I'm trying to reconstruct this now,

18 the documents which I examined obviously cover

19 many hundreds of pages and I was trying to extract

20 from those documents information which I thought

21 could conceivably at some point in the future be

22 | relevant.

23 Q. But why these questions as opposed to

24 | the many other questions that are contained in

25 those surveys?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MR. KEARNEY: Objection. Asked and answered. You can answer the question.

A. I made my judgment. I don't have any deep other reason. I looked at the question, asked myself could this be useful and if so, I recorded it. If I thought it wasn't, I didn't. I still have the documents. I can go back. I was trying

to get myself some idea of what was in them.

recording the questions and responses that appear in these notes which we marked as Sudman 3?

A. My judgment. I think I've answered the question. You asked me and I answered it twice, I think. I'll answer it again. I looked to see

What criteria did you employ in

16 Q. What criteria did you use in
17 determining whether or not a question might be
18 useful or not?

what I thought might be useful and recorded it.

- 19 MR. KEARNEY: Objection. Asked and 20 answered.
- 21 A. Basically as of today, I cannot say what -22 I looked at the question, made a decision to
 23 record it or not and recorded it.
- 24 Q. Let's take a look at the first page on 25 Sudman Exhibit 3, sir. What does the information

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct

in response to the question which you have written

on this page reflect? Does it reflect beliefs,

attitudes, awareness and/or knowledge?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

the question.

A. Does it reflect belief? Yes. Does it reflect an attitude? Yes. Does it measure awareness in some sense? Yes. Does it reflect knowledge? In this case I think the answer is yes.

Q. Does the data contained on the first page of Sudman 3 reflect that 34.5 percent of all current smokers in 1964 thought that the chances of getting lung cancer were the same for people who smoked and people who did not smoke?

A. The first three lines refer to men.

Q. What did it reflect with respect to the beliefs of women who smoked in 1964? MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

the question.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. The question reads: "Do you think the chances of getting lung cancer are the same for people who don't smoke digarettes as they are for people who do smoke digarettes?" You asked me about women who are current smokers?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

24

25

Q. I asked you what the data on Sudman 3, the first page specifically, reflected with respect to women who smoked and their beliefs regarding the --

A. Would you clarify for me what you mean by
who smoked? That could mean women who are smoking
now, which would be current smokers, or women who
used to smoke but are no longer smokers who would
be former smokers?

Q. Sure. Can you tell me, sir, what beliefs women who were smoking in 1964 had with respect to their chances of getting lung cancer as opposed to what they perceived people's chances of developing lung cancer who didn't smoke?

A. That's not the question that's being asked here. It doesn't ask about their chance. It says, "Do you think their chance of getting lung cancer is the same for people who don't smoke cigarettes as they are for people who do smoke?"

It's a general question. For women who currently smoke, 57.1 percent say a smoker is more likely,

36 percent say that a non-smoker is more likely and 4.4 percent say they don't know.

Q. So 38 percent of current smokers in

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
109
    Sudman - direct
    1964 thought that the chances of getting lung
    cancer were the same for people who didn't smoke
 2
 3
    as they were for people who smoked?
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 5
    the question.
                Is that correct?
          That's correct, and 57 percent thought that
 7
 8
    smokers were more likely.
                 (Inaudible conversation between
9
    witness and Mr. Kearney.)
10
                THE WITNESS: Could I hear that last
11
    question again, please.
12
                MR. EDELL: Now that Mr. Kearney has
13
    whispered in your ear?
                                     I said that I
                MR. KEARNEY: Yes.
15
    thought from reading this that the answer was
16
    incorrect because you changed the predicate of
17
    that very last question, Marc -- I don't know
18
    whether you did it purposefully or not -- from
19
    women to all smokers and I want to clarify the
20
21
    record.
                             If I did, I did so by
                 MR. EDELL:
22
    mistake and if you want to clarify it, you could
23
    have asked me and I would have been glad to
    clarify the record.
```

sudman - direct

THE WITNESS: My remark related to -
I had heard it. We had been talking about women.

I thought you did mean women. If you did mean

women, those marks related to that answer.

- Q. Did the beliefs of women with regard to whether the chances of getting lung cancer were the same for people who didn't smoke as for people who smoked change in 1966?
- A. The data in this, as you see it here, indicate that the proportion -- are we talking now about women who are current smokers?
 - Q. Yes.
- from 1964, in 1964, 57.1 percent of women who are current smokers believe that smokers are more likely. In 1966, 63.5 percent. That's a difference of approximately six percentage points. The proportion of women who said the chances are the same dropped from 38.0 to 31.4, a drop of about a little more than six percentage points. The proportion who said non-smokers are more likely remained the same. It was .05 in '64 and .06 and the proportion who did not know was the same, 4.4 and 4.5.

Does the decrease in the percentage of

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
111
    Sudman - direct
    current smokers, current female smokers from 1964
 1
    to 1966 regarding the statement that the chances
 2
    of getting lung cancer are the same for people who
 3
    don't smoke as they are for people who smoke a
    reflection of increased knowledge regarding the
 5
    health hazards of cigarettes?
           I don't have an opinion on that.
 7
                 Does the percentage of 31.4 percent of
 8
    current smokers in 1966 who thought that the
 9
    chances of getting lung cancer were the same for
10
    people who don't smoke as for people who smoke
11
    cigarettes reflect their knowledge?
12
                 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
13
                    You are talking about women in that
    the question.
. 14
15
    question?
                 MR. EDELL:
                             Yes.
16
           I don't have an opinion on that.
17
                 What figure on the first page of
18
    Sudman 3 reflects knowledge?
19
           The last column in a negative way.
20
                 In what way does the last column
21
    reflect knowledge?
22
           The last column is don't know.
23
     people who say they don't know --
 24
                 Don't have knowledge?
 25
           Q.
```

```
Sudman - direct
```

- 1 A. They say they don't know, yes.
- 2 Q. If somebody says I don't know, that
- 3 means that they don't have knowledge. Is that
- 4 | correct?
- 5 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
- 6 the question.
- 7 A. If somebody -- are we talking about this
- 8 specific question?
- 9 Q. Yes, this question here.
- 10 A. The question, "Do you think the chances of
- 11 getting lung cancer are the same for people who
- 12 don't smoke cigarettes as they are for people who
- 13 do smoke cigarettes," when people say they don't
- 14 know, that is some indication, it seems to me, of
- 15 lack of knowledge.
- 16 Q. Do any of the other figures on the
- 17 first page of Sudman 3 reflect knowledge or lack
- 18 | thereof?

- 19 A. Only in total, as compared to the don't
- 20 knows, obviously these are people who at least
- 21 | feel that they have information on this. Are you
- 22 saying -- the question is what is knowledge. We
- 23 are getting into something which is fairly
- 24 philosophical here.
 - Q. In the context of your being an expert

1 in survey research, what does the term knowledge

2 mean?

3 A. Being an expert in survey research doesn't

4 enable me to pontificate about the meaning of the

5 | term knowledge in its general sense.

Q. I thought that you in response to an

7 | earlier question --

MR. KEARNEY: Could I take a break for

9 | a minute?

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

MR. EDELL: Sure.

(Short break.)

Q. I thought you had told us in response to an earlier question that the information in response to the question which you wrote on the first page of Sudman 3 reflected knowledge. Is

that correct?

λ. Yes.

Q. In the context of your response to that question, how did you define knowledge?

A. I looked at the last column, which is the

21 don't know, which is the complement, and I was

22 thinking of the don't knows as in some sense

23 reflecting people's knowledge.

g. So the don't answer, the column the don't answer is the only information on the first

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

€uA	2 A D	_	4 :	-	

- . 1 page of Sudman 3 which reflects knowledge. Is
 - 2 | that correct?
 - 3 A. The other in total, that is, those in
 - 4 | contradistinction to this last column it seemed to
 - 5 me reflect knowledge.
 - 6 Q. Reflect knowledge of what, sir?
 - 7 A. Of the question that's asked.
 - 8 Q. What knowledge does it reflect
- 9 concerning the question that was asked?
- 10 A. I don't have an opinion on that.
- 11 Q. Turn to the next page on Sudman 3.
- 12 What information on this page reflects knowledge?
- 13 A. I don't think this question, this is not a
- 14 knowledge question.
- 15 Q. What on this page reflects beliefs?
- 16 A. All of the columns reflect beliefs.
- 17 Q. What beliefs are reflected in the
- 18 column no opinion with respect to the question?
- 19 A. The belief of no opinion.
- 20 Q. I didn't ask for beliefs. I asked for
- 21 knowledge.
- 22 MR. KEARNEY: I beg your pardon, Mr.
- 23 Edell. I asked for beliefs.
- 24 . MR. EDELL: I meant to ask for
- 25 knowledge.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
```

- A. Let's start again.
- Q. My trend of thought was just
- interrupted. I apologize. Does the column no
- 4 opinion provide us with any information regarding
- 5 the issue of awareness?
- 6 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
- 7 the question.
- 8 A. For this question, for the question, would
- 9 you say that digarette smoking is definitely,
- 10 probably, probably not, definitely not a major
- 11 cause of lung cancer?
- 12 g. Does it reflect any knowledge on the
- 13 part of the people who are, 25.5, current smokers,
- 14 13.8, former smokers and 15.5, former smokers. We
- 15 are talking about men in 1964.
- 16 A. The question is does that column reflect --
- 17 Q. Awareness.
- 18 A. Awareness?
- 19 Q. Awareness.
- 20 A. It reflects no opinion. If you are asking
- 21 about the other columns, we can talk about those.
- 22 Q. I asked about that column, no
- 23 opinion. Does it reflect awareness?
- 24 A. It reflects --

MR. KEARNEY: Awareness of what

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct

1 MR. EDELL: Awareness of anything.

- A. It reflects no opinion.
- 3 Q. I know that. That's the name of the
- 4 | column.

2

- 5 A. How do you mean reflect? In what sense do
- 6 | you mean reflect?
- 7 Q. The same sense that I asked the 8 question with regard to the prior question.
- 9 A. The prior question had to do with a don't 10 know.
- 11 Q. I asked you with regard to the first
 12 page of Sudman 3 whether or not awareness was
- 13 reflected in the information provided in the
- 14 response to the question.
- 15 MR. KEARNEY: I object to the form of the question.
- 17 Q. Now I'm simply asking you whether or 18 not the column no opinion on the second page of 19 Sudman 3 reflects any awareness.
- 20 A. As that question is asked, I can't answer
- 21 | it.
- 22 Q. When you look at the results of the
- 23 responses to the question on the second page of
- 24 Sudman 3 under no opinion, can you make a
- 25 determination as to what those respondents'

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
117
     Sudman - direct
     awareness was concerning the probability,
 ٠1
  2
     possibility of cigarette smoking being a major
 3
     cause of lung cancer?
                 THE WITNESS:
                                Would you read the
 5
    question back, please.
 6
                 (Question read.)
 7
           As that question is asked, I can't answer
    it.
 .9
                 Can you tell us from a review of the
           Q.
10
    column no opinion on the second page of Sudman 3
    for identification what, if any, information those
11
    people who responded to the guestion by indicating
12
    that they had no opinion had with respect to
13
    cigarette smoking and its being a cause of lung
14
    cancer?
15
                 THE WITNESS: One more time, please.
16
                 (Question read.)
17
           As that question is asked, I don't have an
18
19
    opinion on that.
                 Turn to the next page, please, sir,
20
     the question, "Cigarette smoking is harmful to
    health."
               Is that right?
23
24
. 25
     of "harmful"?
```

	118
	Sudman - direct
1	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
2	the question.
3	A. This is the question that the Department of
4	Health, Education and Welfare asks. That's what
5	it says.
6	Q. Do you know how the respondents
7 .	interpreted "harmful to health" in responding to
8	this question?
9	A. Do I know how each respondent to this survey
0	interpreted this word?
1	Q. Yes.
2	A. No.
3	Q. Do you know whether or not they simply
4	interpreted it to be a cough as opposed to lung
5	cancer?
6	A. I don't know.
7	Q. By reviewing the responses to this
8	question, can you make such a determination?
9	MR. KEARNEY: Just to this question?
0	MR. EDELL: Yes.
1	A. The question stands as it stands. People
2	were given the question and they answered it.
3	Q. Can you tell me, sir, by your review
4	of any other information that you reviewed in this

what people understood to be the nature and

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
119
    Sudman - direct
    extent of the harmful effects of cigarette
 2
    smoking?
          Any such judgment would simply, would be
 3
    examining all the data together and it would be
    based, it would be a judgment.
 5
                 I asked for that judgment.
 6
          Are you asking me what I think people
 7
    meant?
 8
                 Do you want the question read back?
 9
10
           Yes.
                 (Question read.)
11
           Do you have time?
12
                 Let's start with pre-1960.
13
                           Why don't you give me an
     make it even easier.
14
     answer to that question for the 1940s.
15
                 MR. KEARNEY: I'm going to ask you to
16
     put the question again since we have had some
17
     amendments and some rereading of the question.
18
                 MR. EDELL: He can answer the
19
                You are objecting to the form of the
     question.
. 20
     question.
 21
                 MR. KEARNEY: I object to the form.
 22
     If you are not going to ask it again, let us
 23
     reread the question. I would like to have the
     question reread with Marc's amendment.
```

3

5

6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. EDELL: That's

(Question read.)

A. I don't have any poll data for the 1940s that would enable me to answer that.

Q. Can you respond to the question for the 1950s?

7 In the 1950s there is poll data on lung There is poll data on other diseases like heart disease and emphysema. I would assume that 10 the responses to that question included in 11 people's minds those diseases but there may have 12 been some who had other diseases in mind and there 13 may have been some who may have had, I don't know 14 That is, those were issues which were polled in the fifties and they certainly could 15 16 have been included here but I don't have any way

Q. Do you have an opinion as to the nature and extent of people's understanding in the 1950s regarding the harmful effects of cigarette smoking?

MR. KEARNEY: You are not asking about this question that's in front of him. Is that right?

MR. EDELL: I just asked a straight

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

of knowing for sure.

```
Sudman - direct
 1
    question, Mr. Kearney.
 2
                MR. KEARNEY:
 3
    misunderstanding because the witness always
    back to the sheet that you've put in front of him
 5
    so can I have the question reread again, please.
 6
                 (Question read.)
 7
          You've introduced the word understanding
 8
    here that I'm fuzzy about.
                                 Do you want to use
 9
    some of the other words that we used before like
    awareness, beliefs? I'll respond to those.
10
    Understanding is a word that again I think is sort
11
12
    of fuzzy.
                You don't understand the word
13
          Q.
    understanding?
14
15
          I don't know what you mean by it.
    tell me what you mean by it, I'll try to respond.
16
17
                Let me ask you this question, sir.
    you have an opinion as to the beliefs of smokers
18
    in the 1950s with regard to the harmful effects of
19
20
    cidarette smoking?
          There are poll data in the fifties which ask
21
    people, smokers and non-smokers, about their
22
23
              I'm willing to report that data.
24
                 I'm not asking you to report data,
```

I'm asking you whether or not you have an

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
122
    Sudman - direct
    opinion concerning the beliefs of smokers in the
 2
    1950s concerning the nature and extent of the
 3
    harmful effects of cigarette smoking.
          The question is really incredibly general.
 5
    You've used words like nature, extent. It really,
    as you've asked that question, I can't answer it.
    If you make it more specific, I'll try to answer
 8
    it.
9
          ٥.
                Do you have an opinion as to the
    beliefs of smokers in the 1960s regarding the
10
    nature and extent of the harmful effects of
11
12
    cidarette smoking?
          As you asked the question, use of the words
13
    nature and extent is more general that I can't
14
    respond to it. If you ask me a more specific
15
    question, I'll try to answer it.
16
                Do you have an opinion as to the
17
    beliefs of cigarette smokers in the 1970s
18
    regarding the nature and extent of any harmful
19
    effects of cigarette smoking?
20
21
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
22
    the question.
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

question again, please.

23

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-8666

Would you read the

THE WITNESS:

(Question read.)

) >	u	a	#	•	n	_	a.	7	£	•	Ç	Ç
1	1												

14

15

16

17

23

24

25

- 1 A. Again, I don't understand what you mean by
 2 nature and extent. I can't answer the question in
 3 the general form that you've asked it.
 - Q. What were smokers' beliefs with respect to their chances of developing diseases from cigarette smoking in the 1950s?
- 7 A. If we can sort of agree at least to talk
 8 specifically about lung cancer, I can remember the
 9 data.
- 10 Q. I want to know all diseases.

 11 MR. KEARNEY: Including lung cancer?

 12 MR. EDELL: If that's a disease that

 13 he wants to discuss.
 - A. Do you want to talk about all diseases simultaneously?
 - Q. Any way that you think would be appropriate to respond to the question.
- 18 A. My memory and, of course, if you want to
 19 give me some data to look at, I'll be glad to, but
 20 my memory tells me that in the fifties of smokers
 21 who had made up their mind, the majority thought
 22 that cigarette smoking was a cause of lung cancer.
 - Q. What about of all smokers?

 MR. KERRNEY: Are you finished your

answer?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Q. You paused. If you didn't finish, sorry.
```

Súdman - direct

5

16

18

19

20

21

22

poll?

3 MR. KEARNEY: He did pause. I'm just 4 asking did you finish your question.

- A. Of all smokers what? What's the question?
- 6 Q. What percentage of all smokers in the 1950s believed that digarette smoking caused lung 8 cancer?
- 9 A. I don't have that figure in mind but all smokers included people who hadn't made up their ll minds yet.
- 12 Q. If a person hadn't made up their mind,
 13 that would be listed as no knowledge?
 14 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
 15 the question. Are you asking about a specific

17 MR. EDELL: Strike that.

- Q. If there was a listing for no opinion, would that show that the smoker did not have any knowledge concerning cigarette smoking and lung cancer?
- A. That doesn't show that, no.
- Q. Does it show that the smoker had knowledge concerning digarette smoking and lung cancer?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
```

- 1 No opinion may or may not indicate knowledge. 2
- 3 What other diseases, sir, do you believe that smokers were aware of in the 1950s
- which were related to cigarette smoking? 5
- My memory tells me again, subject to 6
- correction by looking at the results, that emphysema and heart disease among others were
- diseases that smokers felt were harmful. 9
- say that again. That smokers felt that smoking 10
- had some impact on. 11
- MR. EDELL: Would you read that back, 12
- 13 please.

- 14 (Answer read.)
- What percentage of smokers believed 15 Q. that digarette smoking resulted in heart disease 16 in the 1950s? 17
- I don't have that figure in mind. The data 18 19 do exist.
- of what significance is the percentage 20 Q. of undecided digarette smokers with regard to 21 their opinion as to whether or not digarette 22 23 smoking causes lung cancer?
- MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of 24

25 the question.

> waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

response.

1 A. Would you rephrase that, please? I dan't understand it as you said it.

- Q. What interpretations can one draw from the undecided cigarette smokers with regard to the question of what they thought concerning cigarette smoking and its relationship to lung cancer?

 A. It seems to me the answer is implicit in the
- Q. Does that suggest that they need more information?
- A. I don't have an opinion on that.

They are undecided.

- Q. Did any of the data that you reviewed in this matter suggest to you that consumers of cigarettes wanted more information regarding the health hazards associated with cigarette smoking?

 A. My memory tells me that in an FTC study, there was such a question and that some people, my memory doesn't tell me now whether they were smokers or non-smokers, said they wanted more information on cigarette smoking and health.
- Q. Of what importance is an affirmative response to the following question: "The general public knows all it needs to know about the effects of smoking and health?"

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
127
    Sudman - direct
    the question.
                                    Can I have it
          I had trouble with that.
2
    reread.
3
                 (Question read.)
          In the absence of knowing the context of
 5
    that question, why it was asked, I just don'to
 7
    know.
                I show you use of Tobacco, Fractices,
 8
    Attitudes and Knowledge and Beliefs, United
 9
    States, fall 1964, spring 1966, which was
10
    furnished to us as one of the surveys that you
11
    reviewed. I direct your attention to page 429,
12
    question 216. Of what significance, and I'll
13
    change back to significance as opposed to
14
    importance --
15
                 MR. KEARNEY: Let us read the poll
16
    maybe before you put the question.
17
                 MR. EDELL: Sure.
18
           (Examining document.) What's the question?
19
                 of what significance is the fact that
20
    42 percent of current female smokers strongly
21
    disagreed with that statement?
22
                               Objection to the form of
                 MR. KELRNEY:
23
24
    the question.
                                              It says
           The statement stands for itself.
```

25

```
128
    Sudman - direct
 1
    that 42 percent of women who are current smokers
    disagree with that statement.
                                    I have not thought
 3
    about the significance of this question.
    have an opinion on it.
 5
                 Does this question relate in any way
          Q.
 6
    to the issue of beliefs and awareness regarding
 7
    cigarette smoking and health?
 8
                 MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
 9
    the question.
10
                 THE WITHESS:
                               Can we hear it again.
11
                 (Question read.)
          I won't say that it doesn't but sitting here
12
13
    right now and looking at it, it certainly, it is
14
    not obvious to me how it does, so I guess my
    instant response, which is what you want, if
15
16
    it does, it must be indirect, not direct.
17
                 Let's turn to page 465.
                                         I'll have to
18
    give you the second volume.
                                  I read the question.
19
           (Examining document.)
                 of what significance is the fact that
20
21
    56.7 of current female smokers strongly agreed
    that there should be more education of the public
22
    about the health risk connected with digarette
23
24
    smoking?
```

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9665

Objection to the form of

MR. KEARNEY:

```
129
    Sudman - direct
    the question.
 2
          As of now, I don't see the significance of
 3
    that result.
                What, if any, information does the
 5
    response by current female smokers to the
    question, "There should be more education of the
    public about the health risk connected with
    smoking digarettes" mean in terms of knowledge
    about the health hazards associated with cigarette
10
    smoking?
11
               . MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
    the question.
12
13
          Whose knowledge?
14
                Cigarette smokers' knowledge.
15
          This question does not ask the person about
    whether they think they need more education.
16
17
    a question which asks about the public so there
    may be a connection but if so, it's undirect.
18
    don't see the direct connection at all.
19
20
    if we might take a break.
                MR. EDELL:
21
22
                MR. KEARNEY:
                              Let's take our afternoon
23
    break.
24
                 (Short break.)
25
                Professor Sudman, you reviewed Dr.
```

Sudman - direct Pollay's report?

2 A. I may have seen it. I did not review it to

3 any extent where I can remember anything of it.

4 Q. Do you have any opinions regarding any

5 opinions expressed by Dr. Follay either in his

6 report or his deposition or in his chronological

7 notes?

8 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

9 the question.

10 A. Can we take those sort of -- I don't think

11 I've seen what you are talking about.

12 Deposition? I haven't seen that.

13 Q. That's one of them.

14 A. Chronological notes, I don't know what that

15 is.

16 Q. That's two.

17 A. And the other is what?

18 . Q. His report, his content analysis

19 report.

20 A. . I don't have an opinion on that.

21 g. Do you have any opinions with respect

22 to the opinions of Dr. Joel Cohen?

23 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

24 the question.

25 A. What opinions?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orenge, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666 CONTACTOR

```
Sudman - direct
```

- 1 Q. Any opinions.
- 2 MR. KEARNEY: Object to the form of 3 the question.
- A. That question has -- would you ask me a question that maybe -- that question sort of assumes that Joel Cohen has opinions and that I'm aware of those opinions.
 - Q. I know it does assume that because I was furnished with a report by the defendants which states that you may respond to testimony of Dr. Cohen and Dr. Follay and I just want to know if you have any opinions as we sit here today with regard to any opinions expressed by Dr. Cohen in this matter.
- MR. KEARNEY: Object to the form of the question.
- 17 A. I have not seen any of Dr. Cohen's opinions 18 so in the absence of having seen any of those
- 19 opinions, as of today, I have no opinions.
- 20 Q. You know Dr. Cohen, don't you?
- 21 A. Yes, I do.
- 22 Q. Do you have an opinion with respect to
- 23 his expertise in the area of consumer behavior?
- 24 A. Yes.

11

12

13

14

25 Q. What is that opinion?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 A. He is an expert in consumer behavior,
2 especially in those things that he has studied.

3 Q. In reviewing the opinion surveys that

4 you reviewed in this and in the Palmer matter, did

5 you formulate any opinions with regard to any

6 inadequacies in any of those studies?

7 A. We would have to take them separately. Do

8 you want me to do that?

9

10

Q. However you want.

A. Or answer the question yes or no.

11 Q. One, you have to tell me whether you

12 formulated any opinions and two, we can go through

13 any and all of the opinion surveys that you feel

14 are inadequate in any form.

15 A. In general I thought that the national

16 surveys I looked at were generally adequate and

17 both the sampling and questionnaire design seemed

18 appropriate for what was being done. However, I

19 | think I pointed out earlier that I discarded from

20 my analyses the local studies since I didn't think

21 one could generalize from those to the United

22 States. I also discarded some studies that were

23 | done of very special populations, students in

24 classrooms, because again it wasn't clear to me of

25 what value those would be.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orenge. N. J. 0705Z 201-731-9668 2017013063

```
133
    Sudman - direct
1
          Q.
                Sir, does consumer behavior affect
 2
    information processing?
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
 3
    the question.
 5
          Does consumer behavior --
                THE WITNESS: Read it back to me,
 6
7
    please.
                 (Question read.)
8
            that question is asked, it doesn't make
9
                  I can't answer it.
                boes a consumer's use of a product
11
    affect that consumer's information processing
    concerning any hazards arising out of the use of
14
    the product?
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
15
    the question.
          We are talking about any consumer, any
17
    product or what?
18
                 THE WITNESS:
                               Could I hear the
19
    question again, please.
20
21
                 (Question read.)
          Lat's start off with -- I'm going to try to
22
    respond to that.
                       The question is very, very
23
                        The consumer's use of a product
    multidimensional.
    may affect processing of information about that
```

Sudman - direct

l product. To that extent, not always but there

2 have been situations where consumer use has been

3 | found to be related to consumer processing.

4 | Beyond that, I can't answer that question.

5 Q. In your opinion does consumer use of

6 | cigarettes affect the consumer's information

7 processing with respect to information regarding

8 health hazards of the use of cigarettes?

A. I don't have any information on that.

10 Q. When you say you don't have any

11 information, you have no opinion? Is that what

12 | you mean?

13 A. I have no opinion on that.

14 Q. You saw in your review of all of the

15 surveys differences in response to questions

16 | concerning health hazards associated with the use

17 of cigarettes between current smokers and former

18 smokers and never smokers. Right?

A. Yes.

19

20 | Q. What do you attribute those

21 differences to?

22 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

23 the question.

24 A. The differences obviously might depend on a

25 | whole series of things and it also assumes that

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
135
    Sudman - direct
    there are always differences. In some cases in
    some of the data I show, I saw there were not
    really significant differences but in some cases
    there were differences, and where there were
    differences, it is possible that those differences
    may be due to different demographic
    characteristics of smokers and non-smokers or it
    may be that some of the differences are due to the
    use of the product.
                Did you see any significant
10
          Q.
    differences with respect to smokers' versus
11
    non-smokers' beliefs with regard to the health
12
    hazards associated with the use of cigarettes?
13
          I can't remember right now. Do you want to
14
    help me?
                I would like to help you.
                                            How would
16
    you like me to help you?
          If you show me some data, I'll comment on
18
    it.
19
                Take a look at The Use of Tobacco and
20
    tell me whether or not you see any significant
21
22
    differences --
          You want me to go through all, this?
23
                Whatever you have to.
24
25
```

1 MR. KEARNEY: Let me make this clear. 2 You want him to go through the volume that's in 3 front of us, which is approximately 900 pages that's entitled The Use of Tobacco? MR. EDELL: I don't think that you are really making it clear, Mr. Kearney. 6 The witness 7 said could I help him. If it's going to help him 8 to look at one or two or three or ten or fifty 9 pages, I don't know. If he tells me he will have 10 to review the 900 pages to see whether or not there were any significant differences with regard 11 to the beliefs of non-smokers and smokers 12 13 concerning the health hazards of cigarettes, then . 14 he can tell me that and we know he has to review all 900 pages. 15 I don't recall now where in this document 16 17 these tables are, so that it's not obvious to me 18 howfar I'd have to go before I found a table that might be responsive. 19 20 Let's see if we can help you out a little bit. I can't recall all those questions 21 myself and maybe we can make it easier if we start 22 out with the Gallup polls. I show you a copy of a 23 Gallup poll which was furnished to us by counsel 2'4

for the defendants which is a poll which you

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
137
    reviewed and relied on in this matter,
 1
 2
    specifically page 1500.
          (Examining document.)
 3
                 Do you see the question 542?
       that on the bottom right-hand corner?
 5
 6
          Yes.
                 What is your opinion? "Do you think
 7
    cigarette smoking is one of the causes of cancer
 8
    of the lung," do you see that, sir?
 9
10
11
                 Do you see where, for digaratte
    smokers only, the response under yes was 38
12
13
    percent?
14
          Yes.
                 The response for non-smokers was 59
15
          Q.
16
    percent?
17
                 Is that a significant difference, sir?
18
          I haven't computed that but it certainly
19
20
    would seem that it was.
                 What in your opinion do you attribute
21
    that difference to?
22
           There are multiple factors.
23
                 Please tell us what those factors
24
    that you attribute the difference in the smokers'
```

```
138
    Sudman - direct
    versus non-smokers' response to the question,
    "What is your opinion? Do you think cigarette
    smoking is one of the causes of cancer of the
    lung?"
         It may be due to demographic variables such
    as region of the country, education, race,
             These are one set of variables that are
    gender.
    possible. It could also be due to the actual
 8
    smoking, the use of the product.
10
                Is it your testimony that the Gallup
    poll did not take into consideration the variables
11
    of education; race and gender?
12
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
13
14
    the question.
          Are you asking me from what's printed here?
15
                From your knowledge, sir. You told us
16
17
    before that the Gallup organization was a
    reputable organization and that they are generally
18
    reliable in terms of the questionnaires and the
19
20
    surveys.
                What's the question?
21
22
                MR. KEARNEY: Let's have the question
23
    read back.
24
                Do you know whether or not they take
    into consideration the variables that you
```

```
139
    Sudman - direct
 1
    mentioned such as education, race and gender?
 2
          Tell me what you mean by take into
 3
    consideration.
               . Try to account for these variables.
 5
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Object to the form.
 6
          Try to account for these variables?
 7
                I don't know. Is there a way that you
 8
    people in survey research try to avoid any
    confounding that may occur as a result of these
 9
    type of variables?
10
11
          Well, it is possible if one has sufficient
    size samples to use procedures that would take
12
    into account differences in demographics such as
13
14
    multivariate analysis.
                             I don't know whether this
    has been done. It's not here.
15
                Do you have an opinion, sir, that the
16
    21 percent difference could be attributable to
17
    variables such as education, race, gender and
18
    geographic location?
19
                               I don't know how much.
          Some of it may be.
20
                You don't know what percentage?
21
          No, I don't.
                        Let me see if I can locate a
22
    study that may have taken into consideration those
23
```

Q.

24

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201-731-9666

variables that you are concerned with.

Do you know whether or not the study

```
Sudman - direct
```

1 for HEW was a multivariate study?

2 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

3 | the question.

4 A. My memory of that study is that it mainly

5 compared never smoked, people who had given up

smoke and current smokers. I don't remember

7 | whether indeed multivariate analysis was

8 conducted. Those tables I don't think reflected

9 that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. How would you go about ascertaining whether it was these variables of geographic location, education, race, gender as opposed to use of a product which accounts for the variation between the responses from smokers and non-smokers to the question of whether or not cigarette smoking causes lung cancer?

 $\label{eq:mr.kearney: Objection to the form of the question.}$

THE WITNESS: Could I hear that again, please.

(Question read.)

A. Are we talking about doing a brand new study or analyzing data from an existing study? There are various things that one would do under different circumstances.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Sudman - direct

6

7

8

9

Q. What would you do if you were trying to make that determination with regard to the Gallup poll, the question I specifically gave to you to review in the beginning of this series of questions?

- A. If the data were available -- well, one could do a partial multivariate analysis, limited of course by the sample size and the availability of data running the raw data from the study.
- Q. Did you make any attempt to ascertain
 the what accounted for the differences in response to
 questions concerning the relationship between
 cigarette smoking and lung cancer between
 cigarette smokers and non-smokers?
- 15 A. I did not.
- 16 Q. Do you know whether or not digarette
 17 smoking is addictive?
- 18 A. I'm not an expert on addiction.
- 20 or not a consumer of an addictive drug would
 21 process information concerning the hazards
 22 relating to that drug differently than non-users
 23 of the drug?
- MR. KEARNEY: I object to the form of

25 | the question.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

	Sudman	-	direct	
1			THE	W

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: Can I hear it again.

2 (Question read.)

- A. I have no opinion on that.
- g. Did you make any determination as to whether people believed that smoking in moderation would not result in lung cancer?
- 7 A. This was not one of the things that I
 8 concentrated on but my memory tells me that one of
 9 the surveys or perhaps a couple in the later
 10 period did ask a question of that kind.
 - g. Do you recall the results of that survey, sir?
 - A. I don't, unless you refresh my memory.
 - Q. I'm still trying to find a question that takes into account all those variables that you were talking about before.
 - MR. EDELL: Maybe if we took a short break, I would look at the survey.

(Short break.)

- Q. During the break, I tried to identify a question in one of the surveys that would help us understand what, if any, effect the variables of education, race, gender and demographics might have on the differences between smoker and
- 25 non-smoker responses to the question of whether or

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
 1
    not digaratte smoking causes lung cancer and I'm
 2
    going to direct your attention to page 2213 of the
 3
    Gallup poll public opinion, 1935 through 1971,
    volume three, 1959 through 1971, and see whether
 5
    or not that will help us in trying to determine
 6
    what accounts for the differences in the responses
7
    from smokers and non-smokers.
8
          (Examining document.) The answer is no.
9
    What you see here is analysis variable by
10
    variable, that is, you see age first separately,
11
    then you see education separately and then you see
12
    smoking behavior separately and you don't see, at
    least I don't see, the interaction, that is, those
13
14
    three all taken together, which is what I meant.
                If you wanted to devise a study that
15
16
    would help us understand what accounts for the
17
    differences in the responses to the question of
18
    whether or not digarette smoking may be a cause of
    lung cancer between smokers and non-smokers, how
19
20
    would you devise such a study?
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
21
22
    the question.
23
          I would really have to give it a lot of
              It's a very important issue.
24
    thought.
```

sure sitting here instantly I can -- I mean I

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
144
    Sudman - direct
 1
    don't design studies sort of like that.
 2
    have to think about it and respond and it's
    getting late in the day and I'm not sure I'm up to
 3
    the task of completely thinking this through.
 5
                MR. KEARNEY: Off the record.
 6
                 (Discussion off the record.)
 7
          It is not the kind of thing that I really
 8
    think I could do well in a matter of an hour
           It's something that would take a long time
 9
    to think about but I think it's possible to be
10
11
    done.
                Do you know of any such study?
12
          Q.
13
              not aware of any.
                Sir, I was furnished with an opinion
14
    survey concerning seat belts.
15
                                    What does that have
16
    to do with your opinions in this case?
          It is sometimes the case that people are
17
    confused between knowledge, attitudes and
18
19
               In other words, some people seem to
20
    believe that those might be the same thing and I
    think that's a very serious error.
21
    that because you don't do something of because you
22
    do something that indicates what you know and
23
    believe strikes me as wrong, and seat belts are a
24
```

very, very good illustration of the difference

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
145
    Sudman - direct
    between knowledge, attitudes and behavior, between
 1
 2
    awareness of the issue, attitudes and behavior.
 3
    That is, it is the case that many people, most
    people are aware that seat belts save lives and
 5
    yet as we know unfortunately less than a quarter
    of all people wear seat belts and that's the
 7
    reason that's in there.
 8
                 To explain for us the difference
          Q.
 9
    between knowledge, attitude and behavior?
10
          Yes.
11
                Did you do any research to ascertain
    what the public's relative knowledge was
12
    concerning the risks of cigarette smoking as
13
14
    compared to any other activity?
15
                 MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
16
    the question.
17
          Did I do any research or did I examine the
18
    polls?
                MR. EDELL: Could you read that back,
19
20
    please.
21
                 (Question read.)
          This was not one of the things that I looked
22
    at but I seem, my memory tells me there was a
23
24
    study somewhere that may have asked these
25
    questions or something in that ballpark.
```

1 Mr. Kearney was kind enough to provide 2 us with some computer runs. Can you tell us what they are? (Examining document.) These are computer runs for three Gallup polls, 1954, 1969 and 1971. 5 If you want, I'll go through it page by page. 7 They each talk about the -- the question is at the top and then the answers are split by the ways in which you've seen them, in this document here in this first case first of all by education, then by 10 age, then by race and gender, then by city size, 11 then by region but these are all separate by 12 those, they are one at a time and to go through 13 them, the same thing, that was the 1971 study. 14 The 1969 study is first by education, then by 15 gender and race, then by region, then by These questions now in the 1969 17 education, age. study ask first of all about lung cancer and then 18 ask about heart disease by region again and age -19 and gender. The 1954 study asks the question, 20 "Have you heard digarettes cause lung cancer," by 21 education, by age, gender, region of the country, 22 23 city size and then the same question, "Do you think that cigarettes are a cause of lung cancer,". 24 by education, age, gender, city size, region, so

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
```

1 MR. KEARNEY: In what polls?

2 MR. EDELL: In any of the polls.

A. Shall we look?

Q. Sure.

5 A. So long as we have these three. (Examining

6 document.) What are the categories you want me to

7 examine?

3

8

Grade school versus college, sir.

9 A. All right. Let's see. This is, "Do you

10 | think cigarettes cause lung cancer. The data

11 here are by no schooling, grades one to six and

12 grades seven to eight and for the college, it

13 isn't all together. It's some college and college

14 graduate. So it's a little difficult to tell. I

15 would need a couple of more minutes to sort of add

16 them up and put them together for this.

17 Q. Take your time.

18 A. Okay. (Examining document.) I guess what

19 really is the situation, because there are

20 different sample sizes in each of the categories,

21 in order to sum them up, you'd have to have a hand

22 calculator or something. Let me look at some of

23 the other years and see if there's -- it's not

24 obvious to me looking here. There do appear to be

25 some differences but it's not clear what they

waga and spinelli cartified shorthand reporters

```
149
    Sudman - direct
          Maybe in one of the other years they are
               (Examining document.)
 3
                Do you still have in front of you
          Q.
    volume three, 1959 to 1971 of the Gallup polls,
 5
    sir?
          Yes, I think so.
                Let's take a look at that.
 7
                                              Would you
 8
    take a look at that?
          This is 1969. Is that what you want?
 9
                I thought maybe we could resolve it
10
    instead of going through --
11
          Look, there are --
12
13
                Sir, please take a look at volume
    three, 1959 through 1959 of the Gallup poll, page
14
    2213.
15
          That's what I was looking at.
16
                Do you sée a difference in response
17
    from individuals with a college education as
18
    opposed to a grade school education with respect
19
    to the question as to whether cigarette smoking in
20
    their opinion was one of the causes of lung
21
22
    cancer?
23
          Yes.
                 Is there a significant difference in
24
25
    the response, sir?
```

1 It's a little difficult to tell because I 2 don't know how many people are in each of those 3 Let me read you the numbers for the groups. 81 percent of college people, 69 percent record. 5 of high school people and 64 percent of grade school people think that digarette smoking is one 7 of the causes of cancer of the lung. Without knowing the sizes of the sample groups, one isn't 8 sure but I would suspect that those differences 9 which are of the order of magnitude of 12 points 10 between college and high school and 17 points 11 between college and grade school are likely to be 12 significant, but without knowing the sample sizes, 13 14 I can't be sure. Your experience in reviewing Gallup 15

Q. Your experience in reviewing Gallup surveys is that the Gallup polls would present information that could not be used in a comparative form?

A. Pardon me?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Let me see if I can rephrase it. Do you think that the Gallup polls would have given figures, comparative figures, by education if the figures could not be adequately compared?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of

the question.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1

- Q. Because of size sample?
- 2 A. Now, the Gallup data, you asked me before
- 3 whether those results are significant.
- Q. Right.
- 5 A. Significance, I took it to mean a
- 6 statistical significance. Did you mean
- 7 | statistical significance or not?
- 8 Q. I did mean it in that context.
- 9 A. Statistical significance --
- 10 Q. I think.
- 11 A. -- would depend. I'm sorry. Did I
- 12 | interrupt?
- 13 Q. No, you didn't.
- 14 A. Statistical significance is a function of
- 15 the sample size and the differences between the
- 16 groups. Are you asking me whether Gallup ever
- 17 presented data which was not statistically
- 18 significant? The answer is yes, they might. That
- 19 might very well be the case where there are two
- 20 groups which are very, very similar and they might
- 21 present the data to show that they are similar.
- 22 Q. Let me ask you this. You reviewed a
- 23 significant number of opinion surveys with regard
- 24 to the question of what people believed concerning
- 25 | cigarette smoking and lung cancer, did you not?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

1 A. Yes.

Did you see similar differences
between responses from college educated people as
opposed to grade school educated people with
regard to that issue in other studies in addition
to the one that you have in front of you now?

A. My memory tells me that there were
differences by education.

Q. What does that suggest to you in terms of whether the difference is significant or not?

A. As I said, if I had to make a speculation, I would speculate that these are real differences that one sees here but I just cannot guarantee it without knowing the size of the groups.

Q. What do you attribute the difference between college educated respondents and grade school educated respondents insofar as the reason for their differences in response to the question as to whether they thought that cigarette smoking was a cause of lung cancer?

A. I don't have any data to enable me to answer that.

Q. Do you have an opinion as to why the percentage of grade school respondents was less than college educated respondents with regard to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
153
    Sudman - direct
    the statement that cigarette smoking caused or was
 1
 2
    a cause of lung cancer?
 3
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
 4
    the question. Do you want to have it reread or
    maybe rethink it?
 5
                MR. EDELL:
                             Maybe I'll try to rethink
 6
 7
    it.
 8
          Q.
                Do you have an opinion as to why fewer
    grade school respondents felt that cigarette
 9
10
    smoking was a cause of lung cancer than college
11
    respondents?
12
                MR. KEARNEY:
                               Objection to the form of
13
    the question.
14
          I thought I had answered that and my answer
15
    is I don't have an opinion.
16
                Does the question which appears and
    the response to the question on pages 2213 and
17
    2214 of the Gallup poll reflect consumer knowledge
18
19
    recarding the health hazards of cigarette smoking?
20
          Maybe that's best answered by my reading you
21
    the question.
                      I can read the question and read
22
23
    the responses, sir.
```

Let me just read you the question because I.

think the answer is implicit in the question.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

24

```
Sudman - direct
```

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Q. If it's that clear, just answer the 2 question. Yes or no.

MR. KEARNEY: He doesn't have to

4 answer the question yes or no. You know that, Mr.

5 Edell.

6 MR. EDELL: He doesn't have to read 7 the question to me.

MR. KEARNEY: If you don't like his answer, that's your business, but you can't tell him how to answer the question. Can we have the question reread and let the witness answer the question unless you would like to withdraw the question.

NR. EDELL: No. I would like an answer to the question.

(Question read.)

A. As the question is asked, it says all persons in the survey were then asked, what is your opinion, do you think digarette smoking is or is not one of the causes of cancer of the lung, as it's phrased there, it's an opinion question. I don't have an opinion on whether or not it's a knowledge question.

Q. When were the earliest survey research tools available to cigarette manufacturers to

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

155

017013085

-	u c	100	•	п	_	4	7	1	•	C	c
ì											

- 1 ascertain the level of awareness or belief of
- 2 their consumers with regard to cigarette smoking
- 3 and health?
- 4 A. Could you give me some help? By survey
- 5 research tools, what you mean by that?
 - Q. Opinion polls.
- 7 A. The first opinion polls were conducted in
- 8 1935 by George Gallup and Elmo Roper. These were
- 9 for newspapers and for fortune magazine.
- 10 Q. If a cigarette manufacturer in 1935
- 11 wanted to ascertain what the consumers believed
- 12 were the hazards of using their product, could
- 13 they have done that?
- 14 HR. FARRISH: Object to the form of
- 15 | the question.
- 16 A. I have no idea whether they could or could
- 17 | not have.
- 18 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether
- 19 or not cigarette manufacturers in the 1960s could
- 20 have conducted research to ascertain whether or
- 21 not their consumers believed that digarette
- 22 smoking posed a health hazard?
- 23 MR. PARRISH: Object to the form of
- 24 the question.
- 25 A. I don't have an opinion on that.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
Sudman - direct
```

7

8

9

Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not a digarette manufacturer could have hired someone in the 1940s to have conducted opinion research to ascertain what people believed concerning the health hazards associated with digarette smoking?

MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of the question.

- A. I don't have an opinion on that.
- 10 Q. Do you know Dexter Neadle?
- 11 A. I think I've heard the name.
- 12 Q. Do you know what Dexter Neadle's
 13 reputation is in the, I'm trying to describe it,
- 14 professional community of survey research?
- 15 A. No, I don't.
- 16 Q. Do you know a Dr. Goldhaber?
- 17 A. Pirst name?
- 18 Q. I don't recall it right now.
- 19 A. I don't recall knowing anyone by that name.
- 20 Q. Have you done any work with regard to
- 21 opinion research concerning advertising?
- 22 A. Do you mean as part of my own research?
- 23 Q. Have you done any research, sir, with
- 24 regard to opinion polls concerning advertising?
- 25 A. No.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
157
    Sudman - direct
                Have you reviewed any work regarding
1
2
    opinion polls and advertising?
3
          Yes.
                What work was that?
          Papers submitted to the Journal of Consumer
 5
 6
    Research for publication.
                What papers were those?
7
          I would have to go to my files and look.
₿
                Can opinion research polls be used to
9
    ascertain how advertising is interpreted by people
10
    who see advertising?
11
                MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
12
13
    the question.
          You asked it in a very global sort of a
14
          There are procedures that can be adopted
15
    that make it possible to measure perceptions of
16
17
    ads.
                 Are you aware of any such studies?
18
          The advertising companies do them
19
    continuously.
20
                 How do you know that?
21
          How do I know that?
22
23
           There are organizations which are in
24
    existence to test advertising,
                                      I'm aware these
25
```

•	Sudman - direct
1	organizations exist. I know some of the people
2	who run such organizations and I know that they do
3	advertising testing.
4	Q. Have you ever seen the results of any
5	such testing with regard to cigarette advertising?
6	MR. KEARNEY: Objection to the form of
7	the question.
8	A. No.
9	MR. EDELL: Thank you. Would you mark
10	those.
11.	(Sudman Exhibits 4, 5 and 6 marked for
12	identification.)
13	(Deposition concluded at 4:40 p.m.)
14	
15	·
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	- ,
22	
23	
24	
つま	1

JURAT

I, SEYMOUR SUDMAN, do hereby certify that I have read the foregoing transcript of my testimony, taken on October 27, 1987, and have signed it subject to the following changes:

6	PAGE	LINE	CORRECTION
7	20	20	Title should be caps.
8	99	8 .	possible should be positive
9	129	8	undirect should be indirect
10	141	. 7	omit partial
11			•

DATE: December 24,1907

MY COMMISSION STATE OTHER

of Ocember, 1987

NOTARY PUBLIC

9 day

24

1

2

3

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

CERTIFICATE

I, MARGARET J. TEILHABER, a Certified

Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the States
of New York and New Jersey, do hereby certify that
prior to the commencement of the examination the
witness was sworn by me to testify the truth, the
whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I do further certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that I am neither of counsel nor attorney for any party in this action and that I am not interested in the event nor outcome of this litigation.

iotary sublic of the States of Hew Jersey

Certificate Number X100856

New Jersey commission expires August 7, 1991 New York registration No. 4741157

New York consission expires February 1990

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052 201:731-8666

JURAT SEYMOUR SUDMAN, do hereby certify . that I have read the foregoing transcript of my taken on October 27, 1987, and have signed it subject to the following changes: PAGE LINE CORRECTION ġ NOTARY PUBLIC

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters